



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.



### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



















# SOCIAL ENGLAND

**A Record of the Progress of the People.**

*IN RELIGION LAWS LEARNING ARTS INDUSTRY COMMERCE SCIENCE  
LITERATURE AND MANNERS FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES  
TO THE PRESENT DAY*

*BY VARIOUS WRITERS*

EDITED BY  
**H. D. TRAILL D.C.L.**

SOMETIME FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE OXFORD

VOLUME I


*FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE ACCESSION OF  
EDWARD THE FIRST*

**SECOND EDITION**

NEW YORK : G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

LONDON : CASSELL AND COMPANY LIMITED

1894



NOV 1914  
JUN  
1914

A series of three rows of text, each consisting of a series of dots forming the letters. The first row reads 'NOV 1914', the second row reads 'JUN', and the third row reads '1914'.

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE
LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS . . . . .	xi
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	xiii

## CHAPTER I.

### *ENGLAND BEFORE THE ENGLISH.*

CELTIC BRITAIN . . . . .	1
ROMAN BRITAIN . . . . .	10
HEATHEN BRITAIN . . . . .	30
✓ CHRISTIAN BRITAIN . . . . .	36
WARFARE . . . . .	42
ART AND ARCHITECTURE . . . . .	64
TRADE AND INDUSTRY : PRE-ROMAN . . . . .	84
TRADE AND INDUSTRY : ROMANO-BRITISH . . . . .	90
SOCIAL LIFE, MANNERS, AND CUSTOMS . . . . .	98
AUTHORITIES . . . . .	114

## CHAPTER II.

### *THE DECLINE OF THE ROMAN POWER, A.D. 287—450. BRITAIN UNDER ENGLISH AND DANES, 450—1066.*

THE COMING OF THE ENGLISH . . . . .	116
BRITAIN UNDER THE ENGLISH . . . . .	121
THE DANISH INVASION . . . . .	140

	PAGE
ANGLO-SAXON PAGANISM . . . . .	149
✓ THE ENGLISH CHURCH . . . . .	153.
OLD ENGLISH LAW . . . . .	164
PUBLIC HEALTH . . . . .	173
MILITARY ORGANISATION: OLD ENGLISH . . . . .	176
MILITARY ORGANISATION: DANISH . . . . .	180
OLD ENGLISH LITERATURE . . . . .	184
OLD ENGLISH ART AND ARCHITECTURE . . . . .	193
OLD ENGLISH TRADE AND INDUSTRY . . . . .	201
SOCIAL LIFE AND MANNERS . . . . .	210
AUTHORITIES . . . . .	228

## CHAPTER III.

*FROM THE CONQUEST TO THE CHARTER. 1066—1216.*

THE NORMAN CONQUEST . . . . .	231
DOMESDAY BOOK . . . . .	236
WILLIAM RUFUS—HENRY I. . . . .	244
THE CHURCH AND THE CONQUEST . . . . .	248
STEPHEN—HENRY II.—RICHARD I.—JOHN . . . . .	255
THE CHURCH DURING THE ANARCHY—THOMAS BECKET. THE CHURCH UNDER RICHARD AND JOHN . . . . .	267
ENGLISH LAW UNDER NORMAN RULE . . . . .	274
THE HISTORY OF TRIAL BY JURY . . . . .	285
NORMAN WARFARE . . . . .	299
THE NORMAN FLEET: MARITIME AFFAIRS, 1066—1216 . . . . .	304
NORMAN AND EARLY ENGLISH ARCHITECTURE AND ART . . . . .	319
LEARNING AND SCIENCE . . . . .	322
LITERATURE AND LANGUAGE . . . . .	344
TRADE AND INDUSTRY . . . . .	356
PUBLIC HEALTH . . . . .	367
SOCIAL LIFE, AND MANNERS . . . . .	371
AUTHORITIES, 1066—1216 . . . . .	388

## CHAPTER IV.

*FROM CHARTER TO PARLIAMENT. 1216—1273.*

	PAGE
THE REIGN OF HENRY III. . . . .	391
THE GENESIS OF PARLIAMENT. . . . .	396
✓ THE CHURCH UNDER HENRY III. . . . .	403
THE GROWTH OF JURISPRUDENCE . . . . .	408
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ART OF WAR . . . . .	411
THE NAVY OF ENGLAND . . . . .	411
ART AND ARCHITECTURE . . . . .	415
LEARNING AND SCIENCE: HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITIES . . . . .	429
LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE . . . . .	440
AGRICULTURE . . . . .	450
TRADE AND INDUSTRY . . . . .	457
PUBLIC HEALTH . . . . .	472
→ SOCIAL LIFE AND MANNERS . . . . .	473
AUTHORITIES, 1216—1273 . . . . .	490
INDEX . . . . .	493





## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME.

---

CLOWES, W. LAIRD, Fellow of King's College, London; Gold Medallist, U.S. Naval Institute.

COOPER-KING, Lieut.-Colonel C., late R.M.A.; Author of *A History of Berkshire*; *A Life of George Washington*, etc.

CORBETT, W. J., M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.

CREIGHTON, C., M.A., M.D.; Author of *A History of Epidemics in Britain*.

EDWARDS, OWEN M., M.A., Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford; Lecturer in Modern History at Lincoln and Corpus Christi Colleges, Oxford.

HALL, HUBERT, F.S.A., Public Record Office; Author of *A History of the Customs Revenue*.

HEATH, H. FRANK, Ph.D. Strasburg; Professor of English Language and Literature at Bedford College, London.

HUGHES, REGINALD, D.C.L., sometime Exhibitioner of St. John's College, Oxford.

HUTTON, Rev. W. H., M.A., Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, and Examiner in the Honour School of Modern History at Oxford; Author of *The Marquess Wellesley*; and of *The Misrule of Henry III.*, *Simon de Montfort and his Cause*, and *St. Thomas of Canterbury*, in *English History from Contemporary Writers*.

MAITLAND, F. W., LL.D., Downing Professor of Law in the University of Cambridge.

MANN, A. H., M.A., sometime Exhibitioner of Jesus College, Oxford.

MAUDE, Rev. J. H., M.A., Fellow, Dean, and Lecturer of Hertford College, Oxford.

NEWMAN, P. H., M.A.

OMAN, C., M.A., Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford; Author of *The Art of War in the Middle Ages*; *Warwick the King-Maker*; *The History of Europe*, 476-918, etc.

POOLE, REGINALD L., M.A., Ph.D., Lecturer of Jesus College, Oxford; Assistant Editor of the *English Historical Review*; Author of *Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought*.

POWELL, F. YORK, M.A., Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford; Author of *A School History of England to 1509*; Co-Editor of *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*.

RICHARDS, F. T., M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford.

SMITH, A. L., M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, Oxford.

WILLIAMS, Rev. R., B.A., Keble College, Oxford; formerly Bangor Diocesan Lecturer in Church History; Author of *A History of the Church in Wales* (in Welsh).



## INTRODUCTION.

---

A CIVILISED nation has many aspects, and the story of its life might be told in as many ways. But, broadly speaking, the forms under which it presents itself to observation may be reduced to three. We may consider it either as a Society, as a Polity, or as a State among States. The first and simplest conception of it is, of course, as a Society—a body of individuals associated, primarily, for purposes of mutual support in the struggle with the hostile forces of Nature, and of common advantage in the acquisition and distribution of her products. Association, however, necessarily creates rights and duties; from rights and duties spring law and government; with law and government the Polity is born; and from the intercourse of one polity with another arises the still wider conception of the State among States.

Under which of these three aspects we propose to review the life of the English nation in the following pages is sufficiently indicated by the title of the work. It is with our career as a Society, and not as a Polity, nor as a State among States, that this history is concerned. At the outset, however, it may be as well to guard against the risk of any misconception as to the sense in which our title is employed and the limits within which it applies. Every civilised Society is in the nature of an organism, the shape and direction of whose evolution depend in part upon the action of internal forces and in part upon the influence of its surroundings. Among those surroundings the laws and institutions of every such Society form a most important element and play a very potent part. True as it may be that they often owe both their origin and complexion, wholly or in large measure, to the character of the people who devise or who accept them, it is no less true that they react powerfully upon that character and materially affect its development. Still more obvious is it that, whatever may have been a nation's

natural tendencies of growth, they are liable to be profoundly influenced by the nature of its relations with other States—with States from whom it may learn arts and industries or derive wealth—with States whom it may conquer or be conquered by—with States who may strengthen it by alliances or exhaust it in wars. In strictness of language, therefore, the social history of any country is not, and cannot be, absolutely separable from the history of its political events, its legal and administrative institutions, and its international fortunes. The undue prominence formerly given by historians to these matters has produced a reaction, which is, perhaps, in some danger of running to excess; and the influence of politics upon social progress is again, perhaps, beginning to assert itself as a force of greater activity and potency than a certain modern school of historical writers are disposed to acknowledge. “Drum-and-trumpet histories,” no doubt, deserve much of the contempt which the late Mr. Green, by implication, cast upon them in the preface to his famous work; but nevertheless there are passages in the epic of a nation’s life which seem imperatively to require recitation to the strains of these martial instruments. Without such an accompaniment, indeed, the historical narratives would sometimes be not only inadequate, but positively unintelligible.

Yet, although we cannot entirely detach the history of the Society from that of the Polity and State, although we cannot escape the necessity of combining with our narrative of the material, moral, and intellectual progress of the people some parallel record of their politics at home and abroad, we can approximate sufficiently for our present purpose to a separation of the two subjects. It is open to us, and it has been the object aimed at in these pages, to *abstract* from the political, and to *isolate* the social facts of our history wherever this can be done; to deal as concisely as the demands of clearness will permit with matters of war and conquest, of treaty and alliance, of constitutional conflict and dynastic struggle; but to treat at length and in detail of the various stages of our English civilisation, whether as marked by recognisable epochs in moral and intellectual advance, or as indirectly traceable through those accretions of wealth which, by increasing comfort and enlarging leisure, do so much to promote the intellectual development, and, within certain limits, the

moral improvement of peoples. It is possible, and it is here intended, to dwell mainly on such matters as the growth and economic movements of the population, the progressive expansion of industry and commerce, the gradual spread of education and enlightenment, the advance of arts and sciences, the steady diffusion, in short, of all the refining influences of every description which make for the "humane life."

Such a treatment of the history of a people must obviously follow one or other of two methods. Either their forward movement, from the first rude and simple beginnings of Society to the complexity of modern life, may be viewed throughout as a whole; or the progress made by them in all the various departments of human activity may be examined period by period, in detail. In other words, we may take up a position from which we can survey the entire array of our civilising forces in their wide-winged advance; or we may collect reports from those who have separately followed the onward march of each of the great divisions of which the army is composed. Either method has its advantages, and either its drawbacks. The former undoubtedly presents us with a picture more impressive to the eye, but the latter yields results less bewildering to the mind. What is lost to the imagination through the employment of this method is the gain of the understanding, and perhaps no other justification is needed for its adoption in a work of this kind. For it may at least be claimed for a Social History of England compiled on this principle, that if it will not of itself enable the reader to comprehend the entire subject in all its vast proportions, it is the best preparation which he could have for an attempt to grapple with that formidable task. A powerful imagination, aided by exceptional clearness of head and tenacity of memory, might possibly attack so many-sided a subject *en bloc* with some prospect of success; but for the great majority of mankind a patient study of it, detail by detail, must precede any attempt to survey it as a whole.

There is also, I venture to think, another convenience, and an additional aid to fulness of comprehension, in the method which has been here adopted. By the plan of tracing our social progress through the various departments of activity which sum up the life of a people, that continuous movement from the general to the special, from the simple to the

complex, from unity to multiplicity, which the advance of civilisation involves, and indeed implies, is brought before the reader in, perhaps, the most conspicuous of all possible ways. It "leaps to the eye," so to say, from the very table of contents. As the centuries roll on, the six or seven great categories under which the various forms and forces of social life may at first be divided become unequal to the needs of classification. The accumulating facts under each of them grow too various in character to be massed together without risk of confusion. New activities arise which refuse to class themselves under the old headings. Divisions of the subject throw off subdivisions which themselves require later on to be further subdivided. In every department of our national life there is the same story of evolutionary growth—continuous in some of them, intermittent in others, but unmistakable in all. Industries multiply and ramify; Commerce begets child after child; Art, however slowly in this country as compared with others, diversifies its forms; Learning breaks from its mediæval tutelage and enters upon its world-wide patrimony; Literature, after achieving a poetic utterance the most noble to which man has ever attained, perfects a prose more powerful than that of any living competitor, and more flexible than all save one; and finally, Science, latest of birth, but most marvellous of growth, rises suddenly to towering stature, stretches forth its hundred hands of power, extending immeasurably the reach of human energies, and, through the reaction of a transformed external life upon man's inner nature, profoundly and irreversibly, if still to some extent obscurely, modifies the earthly destinies of the race.

It is surely no reproach to the intellectual faculties of the average modern Englishman that he should require the aids of classification and arrangement to assist him to realise this mighty and manifold advance. To attempt to review the whole line of a moving army through stage after stage of its march might well confuse the perceptions of all save the trained military expert, and dazzle any but the most practised eye. And some such effect could hardly fail to be produced by a Social History of England which, in chapter after chapter, and sometimes even in paragraph after paragraph, should interweave the story of our progress in arts or letters with the record of the growth of our industries and the



expansion of our commerce. It is with the view, as has been said, of avoiding such confusion that the plan of these volumes has been determined on. To those responsible for its selection it has seemed best to treat of each great department of our social life in severalty, and as far as possible (though this, of course, is not always entirely possible) in strict segregation from the rest; and so to arrange the work as that each chapter should carry on the history of our progress in every such department from the point at which the preceding chapter left it.

It may be objected to this arrangement that it inevitably entails a certain amount of repetition. The objection is just, but not, as it has seemed to the projectors of this work, of any considerable weight. Certain events and influences do undoubtedly touch our social history on more than one of its sides, and certain historic personages belong to it in more than one capacity. Economic movements, for instance, are sometimes inseparably associated with changes in manners, arts and industries occasionally overlap each other, the religious leader in early periods is often the promoter of learning, not infrequently also the eminent man-of-letters. All such things and persons require, of course, to be dealt with under more than one section, and have been so dealt with in fact. But it will be found, I venture to think, that these unavoidable duplications are neither numerous nor important enough to weigh against the general convenience of the adopted arrangement.

The various heads, then, under which our Social History may be considered are as follow:—

- I. Civil Organisation.
- II. Religion.
- III. Learning and Science.
- IV. Literature.
- V. Art.
- VI. Trade and Industry.
- VII. Manners.

The general character of the contents of Section I. may be gathered from the foregoing remarks. It will contain a concisely-summarised account of the more important political events of each period, especially of such as have an immediate

bearing on the social life of the people ; but it will be mainly devoted to tracing the development of our administrative institutions (the history of English law and of our judicial system being dealt with in a separate section), and will, in fact, render a continuous account of the various modes in which the Society has expressed and expresses itself as the Polity. Our progress in the arts of military and naval defence, which would properly fall, perhaps, to be treated of under this section, is the subject of a special contribution.

In Section II. we shall deal with the subject of Religion under each of the three distinct forms in which it has influenced our social life—the forms, namely, of faith, worship, and discipline. We shall treat of it, that is to say, not only in its inner aspect as a force, in promoting, directing, or modifying, both by ritual and doctrine, the spiritual energies of the individual citizen, but also in its outward aspect as a system of injunctions and observances affecting civil life as a whole. The twofold or threefold character of this treatment will not at first necessitate any subdivisions of the subject. Throughout those centuries during which the faith of the nation was formulated, its worship directed, and its discipline prescribed by a single authority, the history of the Church of England covers the history of national religion. It is not till after the Reformation and until the centrifugal influences of Protestantism come into full play in the multiplication of nonconforming sects, that it will be necessary to expand this section for the inclusion of all the religious influences bearing upon our Social History.

The combined treatment of Learning and Science in Section III. will, of course, be only possible in the earlier volumes of the work. But during the period covered by those volumes the two titles were, in fact, names of the same thing. Where Science indeed, has from the first depended to some extent on experiment, as in the case of medicine, we begin at once to give it separate treatment ; but it is not till it becomes exclusively and universally experimental that it ceases to belong to the household of Learning and claims an “establishment” of its own. Before that time, both alike begin and end in the study of written records. In this section, however, we shall deal, not only with the subject of the acquisition but with that of the diffusion of secular

knowledge. It will be a combined history of research and of education.

It is, perhaps, unnecessary to observe that Section IV. cannot always, from the nature of the case, be completely separated from the preceding section. The dividing-line between Literature and Science is frequently effaced, even in these days—sometimes, agreeably enough, through the literary gifts of scientific men; at other times, less desirably, through the scientific affectations of contemporary men-of-letters. But in earlier times, when poetry was still in its infancy, and romance and drama and criticism were as yet unbegotten, much of the existing national literature was the literature of Learning, and the appearance of the names of many early writers and their works, both in this and in the foregoing division, was, therefore, inevitable. Nevertheless, the capacities in which they will thus appear being distinguishable from each other, they have a right to the double mention. Primitive epic, for instance, and ancient chronicle may be one; but the influence of the bard on the future of letters and of the language is something quite distinct from his contribution to contemporary learning and to our own knowledge of his time. His achievements in each capacity must be separately studied if his place in the history of English Social Life is to be accurately adjudged. Still, it is only in the earliest volume of this work that cases of this kind will be likely to occur. Later on the distinction between Literature and Learning will become and remain sufficiently well marked.

The subject of Section V. is from the outset more clearly defined. It is, indeed, in its earliest stages that Art is most distinctly independent and self-sufficing—most clearly the product of the natural human striving after the beautiful. In the story of almost every nation the progress of this struggle has an interest of its own, irrespectively of the measure of its success, and it is far from being wanting in such interest in our own country. For a long time, however, the record of success, or at least of distinguished success, is with us, in a certain sense, a limited one. The history of English art is, for many ages, the history of a great architecture—mainly, indeed, of a great religious architecture alone. With the two other leading art-forms—with painting and sculpture—it is long before English Social History has to concern itself; and

we approach almost within sight of our own time before the subject of this section so expands as to compel its subdivision.

It is in the section which follows that the need of specialisation is soonest felt. Under the joint heading of Trade and Industry we have been able at the outset to deal in one and the same article with the entire history of national industry and of national and international exchange, whether of natural or manufactured products. But at an early stage of the work the urban industries claim separation from agriculture; production and exchange soon after part company; and it may be that at last the ever-growing volume of our foreign commerce will require to be treated apart from the history of inland trade.

To the comprehensive title of Section VII. it may be objected that it is of somewhat indefinite import and extent; but it is on that account all the more fitted to describe the miscellaneous character of the matter which it covers, and to enable us to sum up under it all that remains to be recorded in the history of social progress. Needless to say, perhaps, it makes no pretence to be scientific, and indeed it so far departs from strictly logical principles of classification as to introduce a new order of phenomena to the group. For it will, of course, be observed that whereas Religion, Industry, Learning, and the other titles which have been already under consideration, represent forces as well as their realised effects, the title now to be considered has not that duality of meaning. It is, in fact, only a name for the resultant of all the forces in question. The manners of a people are simply such as its industries, its religion, its art and learning and literature combine to make them; for upon the first of these factors depends that wealth which determines the material aspect of manners, while the other factors represent the humanising, refining, and sanctifying influences to which their moral aspect at any given stage of a people's social history is due.

∴ Hence, no doubt, it may be said with truth that every phenomenon recorded in our sections on manners is, strictly speaking, referable to one or more of the sections into which the work is divided. For where it is not the expression of some physical fact or material force, it is the product of some moral

or spiritual agent in the formation of a national character, which has, or should have been, already dealt with elsewhere. Nevertheless, the phenomena in question are so multitudinous that in the vast majority of cases it is only possible to note them in the mass, and without endeavouring to correlate them with each other, or to trace them to their creative causes. To the senses of most of us the social state of any country at any given stage of its civilisation is expressed by—is, indeed, almost identical with—the condition of its manners; and however thoroughly a social history may investigate the inner forces which have made for the civilisation and advancement of the community, it could not complete the picture to the eye, and still less to the imagination of a reader, without devoting an ample, perhaps even a relatively greater space to the presentment of the outward aspect of their lives.

### I. CIVIL ORGANISATION.

It is difficult for those who are confronted as we are at every turn by that endless intertexture of institutions of which contemporary society is made up, to realise the beginnings of our English life. Civil organisation among the earliest inhabitants of these islands—what was it? What meaning would the words have had? Or, if the words themselves are too abstract, what things and thoughts which we should nowadays contemplate under that subject-name were before the eyes and in the minds of the men among whom Cæsar's legionaries sprang, sword in hand, from their galleys on a certain day in the fifty-fifth year before the birth of Christ? Can "Civil Organisation" of any sort be predicated of them; or are not the words, it may be asked, altogether too big to describe appropriately the rude and primitive arrangements of their common life?

Modern research is not of that opinion. It is not so very long, it is true, since the youthful student of this era of our history was not taught to see anything in the men who resisted the Roman invasion but a mere horde of naked barbarians, as little entitled to the name, and as destitute of any of the characteristics, of a civil society as a band of Blackfeet or of Sioux. This yelling, woad-bedaubed savage, however,

has been by this time expelled, it may be hoped for good, from the popular imagination. Much, no doubt, is yet to learn about the race on whose shores the Roman conqueror planted his eagles before the dawn of the Christian era; but enough is known to satisfy us that the words in question are far from being unapt of application to their mode of ordering their lives. Cæsar, in fact, descended upon a country which had been the scene of repeated invasions and of successive conquests before his arrival; and so far were its people from being without civil organisation that they possessed a polity and society, in some measure compounded of and often visibly traceable to preceding ones, which it had in part assimilated and in part displaced.

At some early stage or other in that westward movement of peoples which has continued from prehistoric periods down to our own times, a wave of non-Aryan immigrants, short of stature and swarthy of complexion, had swept over the island, to be followed in course of time by first one and then another incursion of Aryans—of Gaelic, that is to say, and Brythonic Celts; and when Cæsar came, the mixed community deposited by these succeeding floods of invaders showed a distinctly legible history of social growth. The earliest settler, the dark Iberian, had long since been subdued and enslaved by the tall and fair-hued Celt who had followed him, and from whom in language, in character, in mode of life, and form of institutions, the conquered Iberian conspicuously differed. But the Aryan tribesman, with his pride of race and his more advanced conception of property as of a subject not of common but of family ownership, had declined to the condition of a despised villager; so far as social and political importance were concerned, before the Roman conquest. The tribal chief had by that time grown into the tribal king; the free land of the tribe, alike with the common land of the villagers, had become tributary to him; and the two communities, family and communistic, were alike his subjects. It was through the strife of tribal kings, with its consequences of the flight, the exile, and the appeal for Roman assistance of those who had been worsted in the struggle, that the way was opened for the conquest of Britain to the conquerors of Gaul.

A people who had already passed through such a history are surely well entitled to a record of their civil organisation.



But the claim of the inhabitant of pre-Roman Britain is stronger and more enduring than this; for the social system which grew up in these islands between the date of their earliest settlement by westward-journeying explorers and their subjugation by the Mistress of the World has left ineffaceable marks behind it to this day. Dim with the dust of centuries, yet still distinctly visible in dialect and tradition, in boundary lines of shire and diocese, and in the strange survivals of pre-historic feud, the tribal divisions of Celtic England can still be traced, while "the rule of the Roman has been forgotten, even where his villa and his storied gravestone remain."

Long, indeed, as was the period of Roman domination, its four centuries must be regarded from the point of view of our civil progress as a mere interval of arrested growth. Here, indeed, as everywhere, the conquerors set their mark deeply enough upon the outward features of the land which they had made their own. Roman road and Roman villa preserve for us the traces of their labours and their luxuries, and history testifies, in scattered but sufficient records, to the material prosperity, with its opportunities of education and enlightenment for those within the area of diffusion, which grew up under the Roman Peace. But they never succeeded in—they never, indeed, systematically attempted—that work of civil reconstruction which followed so many of their Continental conquests. The great mass of the British remained untouched alike in political institutions and laws as in language, religion, and manners, by the civilisation of their masters. Britain, after four hundred years of government as a conquered province, had done nothing but unlearn the rude military virtues which she originally possessed. She had neither assimilated the administrative system of her rulers nor developed such germs of self-governing capacity as were to be found in her pre-existing social order. Hence in the history of our civil organisation the Roman dominion can only be regarded as, politically speaking, an irrelevant episode—a digression from the main narrative, which does not resume its course again until the Imperial legions have been withdrawn.

And then the thread is taken up by another hand, and from the new masters to which Britain has now to submit herself her civil life receives an impress and her social forces

a direction which are the most marked and most potent that she is destined in all her history to undergo. For the English conquest of Britain laid the foundations of the English social order that we know to-day. The Norman conqueror who came after did for England what the Roman conqueror had not endeavoured, or had failed, to do. He built upon the main lines of that civil organisation which he found in existence at his coming, and widely as the "elevation" of the completed structure may have departed from the prospective ideal of the Saxon architect the ground plan remains his. Henceforth, at any rate—from the "English conquest" of Britain in the seventh century down to the close of the nineteenth—the history of our social order is a history of uniform growth. There are no violent breaks in the narrative, nor, indeed, is there any material departure from what one may call the logical evolution of the "plot." Norman and Angevin, Tudor and Stuart, often working unconsciously enough, added each his chapter to the story; but its lines were laid from the beginning, its development has been continuous, and its course, through all political fluctuations and vicissitudes, orderly. At whatever period in our annals we turn away from the often troubled current of politics to survey the stream of social progress we find the same regularity in its steady onward flow.

## II. RELIGION.

Of the other great agent in civilisation—Religion—a somewhat different story has to be told. Christianity dawned in Western Britain at a period when the civil virtues of the conquered Celts were declining under the paralysing effects of Roman rule; but its early light was naturally feeble, and ere it had time to broaden eastward and southward, Rome withdrew her legions, and a fresh flood of paganism poured over the land. The precise duration of the era thus brought to so disastrous a close is hard to determine. Secular legend contends with religious myth in the pious but futile effort to indicate the apostle of Britain; but history, which cannot even fix with precision the date of the conversion, is naturally silent as to its author. All we know for certain is that there were

Christians in Britain at the commencement of the third century, and that in the early years of the fourth there is evidence of the existence in this country of a fully-organised Church. But the faith spread slowly, and had not permeated the mass of the people even of Southern Britain when the Roman occupation came to an end, and the one bond of connection between these islands and the western centre of Christianity was thus violently severed. The conquest of Britain by the pagan English "thrust a wedge of heathendom," as Mr. Green has picturesquely put it, "into the heart of that great Christian communion which comprised every country, save Germany, in Western Europe, as far as Ireland itself"; and it was from this furthest point of illumination that the rays of Christianity were destined to be reflected back upon the intervening darkness. It was due to the ardour and devotion of Irish missionaries, and to the spirit which they infused into the Saxon princes who had embraced Christianity, that the light kindled by Augustine in South-eastern Britain was not extinguished in blood.

Nevertheless, if it was the Celtic Church which conquered England for Christianity, it was to the Roman obedience that the country was won. The struggle of over two centuries between the old faith and the new was followed within a few years of its close by a controversy among the victors as to the ecclesiastical rule which it was their duty to follow. At the Council convened for the settlement of this momentous question the claims of the Irish Church were rejected and the authority of Rome prevailed. Following up her victory with her wonted promptitude, she despatched the Greek monk, Theodore of Tarsus, to fill the archiepiscopal See of Canterbury, and the CHURCH OF ENGLAND as we know it to-day was born.

Its history for the twelve hundred years which have since elapsed has been, in large measure, the history of the nation, for which, indeed, during some nine or ten of these centuries, it was only another and a spiritual name. That its periods of development and of arrested growth, of prosperity and adversity, of splendour and obscurity, have always had their counterparts in contemporary secular eras, it would be too much to say. The temporal history of the Church in England, as in most European countries, has always been a

subject of controversy. It touches the burning fringe of party politics at many points, and men of opposite opinions as to the proper policy of the State in civil matters cannot be expected to take the same view of the influence of the Church on social progress at certain given periods of her history. True, their differences turn mainly on political questions; true, the direct action of the Church upon society has, except during certain rare and brief intervals of corruption or stagnation, been too manifestly beneficent to admit of dispute; yet nevertheless—and there is here an illustration of the truth on which it seemed desirable to insist at the outset of these remarks—it is impossible so to separate the social from the political organism as to justify us in regarding the political conduct of the Church of England throughout the various ages of our history as without bearing on our social destinies.

It would be the merest pedantry, for instance, to treat the great conflict of the twelfth century between the Church and the Crown—between the civil and the ecclesiastical jurisdictions—as a mere episode in our political history, as an incident which the social historian as such can afford to regard with indifference, or at any rate to study as a subject lying outside the sphere of his special work. The importance of that struggle was no less momentous from the social than from the political point of view. It would, indeed, be absolutely irrational to suppose that a question so profoundly affecting civil life in so many of its relations as was then in issue could have nothing or but little to say to social history. Should the Church possess judicial authority co-ordinate with and independent of, if not encroaching on, that of the State? Or were the State courts to be supreme? Primarily, no doubt, the issue here is an issue of politics, yet it is surely evident that its decision in a great measure determined the line of development of our English social body. Clearly it cannot be a matter of indifference to any society whether civil or ecclesiastical influences prevail in directing its advance.

Sometimes, it is true, in those shifting scenes which show us the Church of England now active in the assertion of its spiritual privileges or temporal pretensions, now allied with the champions of popular rights against the Crown, the

political side of its history overshadows every other aspect of it. Throughout the reign of John and into that of his son and successor it may, with substantial truth, be said that the political and the social importance of the Church varied inversely with each other. Its prominence as a participator in the strife of politics had never been so marked ; but it was a stationary, and became at last a declining, influence on private life and manners. Great as had been its gains in popularity through its attitude in the struggle for the Charter, they were not so great or nearly so important as its losses in popular reverence. Everywhere its prelates and clergy displayed signs of a growing secularisation of temper and of habits. Preaching had fallen into disuse, the monastic orders had degenerated into mere wealthy landowners, the ignorance of the priest left parishes without the reality of spiritual direction, even when his non-residence did not deprive them of its very form. Services were neglected and pluralism abounded, abuses of all kinds were rife, and the temporary failure of the Church to keep pace with the moral needs of the nation was attested by the eager interest with which the coming of the friars was welcomed by the people.

For the revival of religion that followed, these devoted missionaries are no doubt entitled to the chief credit. Yet the Church which their enthusiasm did something to awaken was soon to find them sharing with her in that process of degeneration which went on through the next period of relapse. It is curious to contrast their condition in the first quarter of the thirteenth century with what it had become in the second half of the fourteenth, to reflect on the change which had taken place between the time when thousands of followers flocked, full of religious zeal, to the outstretched hand of the mendicant preacher, and the time, not much more than a century later, when Wyclif could, with general applause, denounce them as "sturdy beggars," and declare that "the man who gives alms to a begging friar is *ipso facto* excommunicate."

These words were uttered by a man who was not content with mere denunciation, and in the struggle of Lollardism, from the initiation of the movement by Wyclif to its final suppression some thirty years after his death, we have an illustration of that recuperative principle within the Church

itself by which it was revived and preserved from age to age, until, purged more thoroughly and renovated more completely than ever before by the great convulsion of the Reformation, it finally assumed that place in the guidance of the moral and spiritual progress of the people which, except for one comparatively brief period in a later century, it has never lost.

And it is, of course, on that momentous crisis in the fortunes of Europe that the profound interest which the Church and religion of the nation possess for the student of its social history mainly concentrates itself. For the future of civil society in England, as in every European country, may almost be said to have turned on its choice between the old faith and the new. The far-reaching consequences of that choice stand inscribed for us indeed on wider tablets than those of the history of a single continent: they are written across the face of the world. There is a form of civilisation suited to the genius of Catholicism and to the racial characteristics—on which, however, it also importantly reacts—of the nations which took the Romeward road at that great parting of the ways; and it is not the concern or within the purpose of this work to compare this form of civilisation, either favourably or unfavourably, with that which has flourished and advanced in countries holding the Protestant form of the Christian faith. It is enough that the two forms are essentially distinct, that they lend themselves respectively to the development of wholly different moral and intellectual qualities, and that the people which definitely accepts one of them must be content to travel to its goal at a different rate, if not by a different route, of progress from that of the other. Hence it is that the decision between the claims of the two faiths which contended at the Reformation was of such vast social as well as political and religious importance. Issues inconceivably remote from the question of the number of the Sacraments, or the Petrine Commission of the Pope, and—if temporal may be compared with spiritual things—of vastly greater moment, it might be said, to humanity, were tried out in that tremendous struggle; and the results of the trial for most European countries, and for England pre-eminently, are visible to those who look around the world to-day, with an impressive clearness which even the most

vivid and powerful imagination of the great men of either Church who took part in that conflict could not possibly have realised.

By that fateful decision of the sixteenth century the whole future course of our social history, so far as religious influences have guided it, was determined. For the Reformation was the unquestionable though not the immediate progenitor of that great spiritual movement of the ensuing century which left an impress on the life and manners of the nation so deep and so abiding as to be still plainly discernible, after an interval of two hundred and fifty years, in some of the most conspicuous and characteristic qualities of our people. Without Protestantism, no Puritanism; and without Puritanism the Englishman of to-day would have been a different man. Not only in thought and feeling, not only in moral and intellectual temperament must he have deviated from the existing type, but his whole scheme and theory of life, his rules of individual conduct, his code of social usages, his tastes and amusements, his preferences in literature, his attitude towards Art—in a word his entire estimate of the relative proportions of human interests and human objects, would have been other than they are. The history of Puritanism is properly speaking, of course, a part of the general history of religion; and after the birth of the Puritan movement the religious factor in our social growth can no longer be identified as heretofore with the now waxing, now waning influence of the English Church. Yet the Church, though it resisted and for a time suppressed the Puritan movement, was itself and still is affected by it; and indeed may fairly be said, from the date of the Wesleyan revival to that of the Tractarian reaction, a period of a hundred years, to have been indebted for the chief sources of its vital energy to the Puritan spirit. And since it was in the largest, the soberest, and on the whole the most conservative class of Englishmen that this spirit arose in the sixteenth and renewed itself in the seventeenth century, so it is in this great middle class—the class that typifies the whole people for the foreigner, and even, so far as we may judge from popular conceptions, and from the caricatures that reflect them, for themselves—that its survival is the most marked at the present day. Culture and scepticism, and the growth of luxury and



refinement are no doubt affecting it, but to an extent which only seems considerable because the cultivated and sceptical, the refined and luxurious minority exaggerate it. The exaggeration is apt to deceive, because the classes who have outgrown the influence of Puritanism are as disproportionately vocal as they are relatively small, while the classes among whom that influence is still dominant are a virtually voiceless multitude. But the impartial student of the national character is constantly being confronted with evidence to the fact that the process of so-called "emancipation" has reached but the merest fringe of the community, and that the great bulk of middle-class Englishmen are still, to all intents and purposes, the true spiritual descendants of a Puritan stock.

### III. LEARNING AND SCIENCE.

The spiritual and intellectual factors in our social development may here, perhaps, with advantage be still pursued, though another order of arrangement is for the most part followed in the body of the work ; and here, perhaps, it may be in place to say that the sequence of subjects will often vary in successive chapters, according to the prominence or importance of those subjects at the particular period dealt with. The history of Learning and Science runs parallel with that of religion, and sometimes, though not always, in the same channel. In the earlier ages of our social history, however, the identity of the two is, of course, almost unbroken. At a time when Learning was the monopoly of the ecclesiastical order it was inevitable that its progress should mainly follow religious lines. The careers and characters of those who promote it will often fall to be dealt with under the head of Religion, and sometimes under that of Literature also ; for the earliest literary efforts of men so situated will, for the most part, be devoted to religious subjects, while at the same time they naturally form the beginnings of Learning for the otherwise rude and unlettered society in which they appear. Thus Cædmon, among the earliest of Saxon poets, throws Scripture into metrical paraphrase ; and Alfred,



as a translator of Beda, lays the foundations not only of a Saxon prose but of English history.

It is not, indeed, till after the rise of the English Universities, nor even then immediately, that the fortunes of Learning can be said to have detached themselves from those of the Church. The academic system was, it is true, ecclesiastical in form and origin, and even to a certain extent, in affiliation. The wide extension which mediæval usage gave to the word "orders" still gathered the whole educated world within the pale of the clergy. "Whatever might be their proficiency, scholar and teacher were alike clerks, free from lay responsibilities or the control of civil tribunals, and amenable only to the rule of the bishop and the sentence of his spiritual courts." Nevertheless, as the collegiate foundations testify in their very origin to a decline of the impulse towards exclusively religious endowments and reveal a new desire to dedicate wealth to educational instead of to more literally "pious uses," so in their development and in that of their mother Universities does the secularising spirit which gave birth to them become more and more conspicuous in its operation and potent in its effects. The influence of the Church, so seriously threatened by that great expansion of the field of education which coincides with the rise of the Universities, was to some extent indeed to be re-established by the aid of the Friars and the renewed supremacy which their teaching procured for scholastic theology in the academic course. Yet from this very school sprang Roger Bacon, whose hand was to unlock the doors of the temple of Science, and to reveal at least a glimpse of those treasures within it which future generations were to explore.

The great Friar, however, was born before his time; the age in which he lived was not yet ripe for those studies which in after ages were to be pursued to such mighty issues. Scholasticism was destined to remain for yet two centuries supreme. But it is no unmeaning chapter in the history of our intellectual progress that contains the record of its sway. Its system was an unrivalled course of discipline in clear thinking, in vigorous analysis, in searching criticism, in the comprehension and use of every weapon in the armoury of human reason. If knowledge made no advance under the reign of scholasticism, the instruments of knowledge were

being steadily, if undesignedly, brought by it to perfection. It was the schoolmaster to lead men to science. Such fruits as it produced in the meantime were exclusively, it is true, of the theological or ecclesiastical order; they are to be traced in the daring Erastianism, as a later age would have called it, of Ockham, and in the reforming energies of Wyclif. But its methods were all the while preparing the faculties of man to appropriate and profit by the great possessions into which they were one day to enter.

With the discovery of the New World a new era dawned upon the human mind. The great period of the Renaissance opened; and first in Italy, then over all the Continent, and then finally in England, the Revival of Letters stirred the human mind into more vigorous activity. The rise and progress of the New Learning belongs in part, but in part only, to the history of Religion. It has had much to say to the advance of knowledge on the secular side, and pre-eminently so through its influence on education. Dean Colet's foundation of St. Paul's was the first step in an educational movement which was destined, in the course of a generation or two, to transform the face of the country. The aim of the founder was the union of rational religion with sound learning, the exclusion of the scholastic logic, and the steady diffusion of the two classical literatures. Greek, the newcomer, did not obtain admission without a struggle, but it established itself in time. Not only did its study creep gradually into existing schools, but the influence of Colet's example was so powerful that new foundations came in numbers into existence in which Greek was from the first included in the curriculum. More grammar schools, it has been said, were founded in the latter years of Henry, than during the whole of the three preceding centuries. The grammar schools of Edward VI. and of Elizabeth carried forward the movement, which by the end of the century had completed its transforming work.

Nor was the influence of the New Learning confined to the earlier, the primary and secondary, stages of education; it invaded, and, after a sharp conflict at each of the two Universities, it mastered the higher education also. For a time it divided Oxford between its partisans and its opponents—the "Greeks" and "Trojans"; and the spirit of

contention rose high enough in one instance, at any rate, to provoke interference and call forth rebuke from the king. But in the Universities, as in the schools, the triumph of the New Learning was not long delayed. A newly-founded college in Oxford signalled itself by the establishment of the first Greek lectureship; the Crown at a later time created a professorship of the same study; and the work was consummated by Wolsey's munificent foundation of Christ Church.

At the full tide of the educational movement, in the first years of the reign of Elizabeth, Bacon was born—Bacon, who may with substantial accuracy be described as a born philosopher who mistook himself for a man of science, and whose contribution to the intellectual advancement of mankind, though large in amount, was widely different in character from his own conception of it. His design was to lay the foundations of a true method of scientific inquiry; his achievement was to devise and expound a system which, while as a whole it is not that of science, yet anticipates modern scientific methods in many striking ways. He insisted, and rightly, on the Experimental Principle, though he attained to no true comprehension of experimental methods; and to have succeeded in the former, even while failing in the latter point, was an achievement which can only be properly appreciated by those who have due regard to the educational dogmas and intellectual superstitions against which Bacon had to contend. But apart from the services—great, if misunderstood, both by himself and others—which he indirectly rendered to the cause of natural science, a large debt is due to him from the whole body of human studies then awaiting the application of that great principle which Bacon insisted upon in physics as a condition of advance. If the two words which entitle this section be distinguished—if Learning, that is to say, be treated as a generic and Science as a specific appellation—we shall have to admit that the work of Bacon in behalf of the wider was even greater than that which he accomplished for the narrower cause.

As the seventeenth century advances, the horizon of knowledge—including thereunder the contributions made by deductive reasoning, by inductive inquiry and by criticism of ancient records—immeasurably widens. Old methods of inquiry are more fruitfully pursued; scholarship, wielding

fresh weapons, enlarges the borders of erudition; new experimental sciences are born, and the oldest of all the deductive sciences achieves its greatest triumph in the hands of the most illustrious of its students. It is the age of Harvey and Sydenham, of Boyle and Gilbert, of Locke and Hobbes; above all, it is the age of Isaac Newton. The Royal Society is founded, and enrolls the greatest astronomer of all time in the list of its presidents. By the close of the seventeenth century the whole face of the intellectual world had been transformed. The Science upon which Swift looked forth in scorn at the beginning of the next age, and on which he cut his irreverent jests in "Gulliver"; the philosophy which he ridicules in the "Voyage to Laputa"; nay, the very Learning against which he so audaciously measured himself in the "Battle of the Books," wear an aspect wholly different from that which they would have presented to the eye of any observer at the beginning of the reign of James I. Philosophy and Science bore indelible traces of the labour of Locke and Newton, and Learning would have been at another stage than it had by this time reached in England if Bentley had never lived.

Through the first half of the ensuing century the rate of progress in the sciences a little slackens, but it recovers towards its close. There are foreshadowings of the age which was to follow and in its course to add more by a thousandfold to the volume and import of scientific discovery than had been slowly and doubtfully accumulating during the countless cycles that had elapsed since the dawn of human intelligence. In its earlier years, as has been said, the eighteenth century was more remarkable as an era in the history of our national literature than for any contributions to the advancement of Science. Its second half was rendered memorable by the application of physical research and mechanical invention to industrial purposes; and in this respect its achievements belong rather to the economic division of our survey. Yet pure science was not neglected in any of its main departments. Herschel in astronomy, Hunter in anatomy and physiology, Black, Cavendish, and Priestley in chemistry, are names memorable and reverend in the annals of British Science, and every one of them recalls some important conquest won for humanity in the region of the unknown.

But, if for no other cause, the period would deserve to be lastingly remembered as having, in the great work of Adam Smith, given birth to a new science, which, if the successors of its founder have failed to advance it to conclusions as universally true and as irrefragable as was once expected, has probably done more for human happiness and prosperity during the hundred and twenty years which have elapsed since its principles were first enunciated in the "Wealth of Nations," than any other product of the pure intellectual energy of man.

The birth and early years of the nineteenth century found our country still locked in the death-grapple with Napoleon; and though even so, there is, of course, discernible, as with every nation which still retains its vitality, a steady, if not very rapid or extensive, widening of the field of knowledge throughout this period, it was not till the century had well-nigh half run its course that that extraordinary scientific movement which has given it its place among the ages first took its rise. The application of steam to terrestrial locomotion dates from late in its fourth decade, and it was only in its fifth that our railway system first flung wide that net whose meshes we have ever since been weaving closer and closer over the land. Electric telegraphy dates its beginning from much about the same time, though the growth of its employment in the arts of life was for a long time sensibly slower than that of its coëval power. It was, perhaps, not until the Fifties that Science began to advance in earnest, but from thenceforward its rate of progress has been increasing almost continuously, until it has reached its present bewildering speed. No doubt it is in the domain of applied physics, and notably in that part of their domain to which belongs the wonder-working science of electricity, that this rush of discovery and of the utilisation of discovery is the most conspicuous. The employment of this force for the three purposes of sound-transmission, of illumination, and of locomotion, represent three distinctly novel applications of it, dating all of them from within the last quarter, if not the last twenty years, of the expiring century. And not only, so far as we can judge, is the number of these applications still a long way from being completed, but the extent of progress possible in those departments of activity to which this Protean force has

already been applied seems quite beyond the reach of precise estimation.

Nevertheless, it is not in applied physics alone that the progress of human knowledge, and the part played in it by our country, have during the last and present generations been remarkable. Nay, it is not in that domain that our conquests, though the most striking to the eye, have been the highest as achievements of the human mind, or even, perhaps, the most potent in their ultimate effects upon the future of the race. While the discoveries of the physicist, appropriated and applied by the engineer, have transformed the outward aspect of English life, the great work of Darwin has been effecting a silent revolution in the mind of man. The publication of the "*Origin of Species*" marked an epoch, not merely in the record of scientific inquiry, but in the whole history of human thought. It has profoundly affected all studies, of whatsoever description, into which the nature of man—whether in its moral, its physical, its intellectual, or its spiritual aspect—enters as a factor to be considered. History, psychology, ethics, economics, have all taken a new departure from the starting-point indicated to them by the doctrine of Evolution. It may be said to have founded that science of Comparative Theology—if we may so call it—which for the first time has brought the methods of scientific inquiry to bear on the history of religion and of the religious instincts in man. There is, it must be repeated, not a single study having any affinities with biological science or depending in any of its processes on the conclusions of the biologists, which has not received both a new impetus and a new direction from the Darwinian theory.

But in every branch of Science the progress made during the last half-century has been immense. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that in almost every department of scientific inquiry—not only among those to which the name of "physics" should in strictness perhaps be confined, but among those also which are more directly concerned with the human economy than the constitution and laws of external Nature, and among those, lastly, such as chemistry, which may be regarded as intermediate between the two—discoveries of a far-reaching, sometimes of a revolutionising character, have during the period in question been made. Chemistry has

developed its always subtle processes to a pitch of almost inconceivable delicacy ; physiology has widely extended its domain and revised its conclusions by the increasingly helpful aid of microscopic research ; surgery, through the invention of the antiseptic treatment, and in many other ways, has made vast advances ; therapeutics and sanitation have achieved successes which would have been unattainable, and have entered upon an almost boundless field of conquest which would never have been opened to them but for the construction and application of the germ theory of disease. In branches of inquiry unconnected—except as all instruments of human enlightenment are related to human interests—with the physical nature of man, the progress accomplished has been more remarkable still. The laws of the great cosmic forces—of heat and light, of magnetism and electricity—have been investigated, with the result that our knowledge of the behaviour of these forces, in regions or at stages of their operation which lie outside the cognisance of the senses, has now been placed on a basis of more assured hypothesis than they ever rested on before. And, highest triumph of all, the discovery of the world-embracing and time-spanning principle of the Conservation of Energy has knit the entire body of the physical sciences together, and practically made one science of the whole.

#### IV. LITERATURE.

To tell the story of English literature adequately within the limits of this preliminary sketch would be an even more hopeless task than that which has just been imperfectly attempted in the case of Learning and Science ; for the beginnings—even the noticeable beginnings—of literature are earlier, the contributories to its growth are much more numerous, the causes which have directed the course of its development in this direction or in that are at once more obscure in their origin and more subtle in their operation ; while, finally, the fact that the history of a literature is at once a history of thought and a history of language, instead of being, as is the case with religion or science or philosophy, a history of thought alone, must indefinitely enlarge the field of inquiry. A subject so



vast, however, may be said, in a certain sense, to simplify itself. A survey of it within the limits of a few of these preliminary pages must of necessity conform to one of two types. It must either take the shape of one of those severely compressed summaries which always threaten to resolve themselves into a mere catalogue of names and dates, and frequently fulfil the threat; or it must content itself with merely noting the great "periods" in the history of English letters and its great epochs of change.

In such a sketch, for instance, as the present it would be impossible to traverse otherwise than cursorily that long and interesting era of literary growth which stretches, roughly speaking, from the seventh to the fourteenth century. The history of Old English poetry, whether in its lyric form from Cædmon downwards, or in that rude barbaric shape of which the epic of "Beowulf" is the earliest example; the development of Old English prose, from its cradle, so to speak, in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, to that arrest of its growth which befell it in the eleventh century, will be found traced in adequate detail in the second chapter of this volume. So, too, with that critical period in the fortunes of the language and its literature which began with the Norman Conquest and may be said to have lasted until after the accession of the dynasty of Anjou—that period during which our speech and literature, banished from the Court by French and Latin, still maintained themselves among the people, giving proof of that indestructible vitality in the strength of which they were ultimately to prevail. Over this era and the most memorable work which it produced—the "Brut" of Layamon, that monumental testimony to the self-sustaining vigour of our English tongue which, written nearly a century and a half after the Conquest, contains in thirty thousand lines but some fifty words of the Conqueror's language—it is impossible to linger here. One must hasten onward through another century and a half, when the struggle between the two languages had at last ended in the final triumph of the native speech, and Chaucer entered in, not merely to reap the fruits of victory, but to reunite the victor and the vanquished, and to work the surviving remnants of the Norman-French into that matrix of pure English from which the pure gold of his poetry emerged.



For the philologist himself, as distinct from the critic, the poems of Chaucer must ever possess supreme interest, for they constitute an imperishable record of the state of the written language at a momentous epoch of transition. That the poet himself did not merely register but contributed to the transitional process is probable enough. Inspired innovation has been the prerogative of the highest literary genius in all ages, and it may well be that Chaucer's courtly, official, and diplomatic training revealed to him points of vigour or of grace in words and idioms of the Norman-French with which he was tempted to strengthen and enrich the English of his verse. But it is certain that these additions cannot have been important in amount. The old notion of the seventeenth-century writers—that Chaucer, writing in English upon most familiar English subjects, and producing works which at once made him the most popular writer of his time and country, yet “corrupted and deformed the English idiom by an immoderate mixture of French words”—is repugnant to common sense. There can be no reasonable doubt that the bulk of the words in question—and their proportion to the whole is small—had already won their way into the speech of the nation, and that all that the poet did was to fix them in its literary language.

And it is literature—the world's literature—not English philology, which has the first claim upon Chaucer. Whatever had been the linguistic peculiarities in the external structure of his poetry—if, that is to say, it had taught us as little of the history of our tongue as, in fact, it teaches us much—the place of that poetry in the story of our civilisation would nevertheless have remained unaffected. The unrivalled array of poetic qualities, both of feeling and expression, which it presents to us, the grace and gaiety of the poet, his humour and pathos, his dramatic force of portraiture, the catholicity of his sympathies, never to be again approached in literature till the coming of Shakespeare, his fine broad artistic treatment of the human figure, the dewy freshness of his landscape studies, and the clear sunny atmosphere through which he looks out alike upon Nature and upon man—it is these things which have raised the Father of English Poetry to the rank of one of the great poets of the world. It is in virtue of such things that that train of pilgrims which left Southwark for the

shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury, on a certain day of April in or about the year 1383, remains so real to us, that the student still labours to fix the precise date of its departure and the times and places of its halts. It is for such reasons that these shadows of the poet's fancy are shadows more enduring than their substance, and that knight and squire, clerk and franklin, reeve and miller, pardoner and sompnoir, prioress and nun, and wife much widowed, move still, and will ever move, before us across the great imaginative panorama of the past, joyous and immortal as a Bacchic procession on a frieze of Phidias.

But Chaucer's light in literature was of as brief a radiance as Wiclif's in religion, and was followed by the re-invasion of as dense a gloom. Again we have to carry the eye forward for another century over the sombre period covered by the long war with France and the civil strife which followed it in England; nor do we find anything to arrest the gaze until we reach that great time of awakening which dawned for England, as for all Western Europe, with the Revival of Letters, the invention of printing, and the discovery of the New World.

The story of the century that followed is itself the history of a literature. England was slower than some countries to feel the quickening of the Renaissance, but that magical influence made itself felt at last. First the poets of mediæval Italy, then the Greek and Latin classics, began to win their way to the heart of English culture. Translations of Tasso and Ariosto showed the new interest of Englishmen in the chosen land of this intellectual dayspring; versions of the more famous works of classical antiquity followed, and before the close of the sixteenth century the greater poets and historians of Greece and Rome had been given to the English people in their own tongue. But meanwhile to the native Muse herself the awakening had come. In the poems of Wyatt and Surrey and their contemporaries there were signs not only of the stirring of that new life of thought and fancy, but of the beginnings of that new feeling for metrical form which were to find their culmination in the "Faerie Queene." An English prose began to feel its way in the writings of Ascham and of Hooker to its present structural form, and to dare with Sidney—if experimentally, and not always in a

spirit of wisdom—to borrow colour from imagery and warmth from rhetoric. And, last and greatest birth of all, the “Morality” and Mystery play of the Early Tudor period brought forth that glory of the world’s literature, the Elizabethan drama—that ever-broadening light upon the face of man and Nature which had its flush of dawn in Marlowe and its meridian splendour in Shakespeare.

The sixteenth century passes into the seventeenth; the burst of song sinks gradually into silence; the fire of dramatic genius burns lower and lower and at last expires, never again to be rekindled, except at times into a faint and transient flicker, throughout the ages which have since passed. But still the stately march of English literature, in mighty verse or memorable prose, through Milton and Dryden, through Bacon and Jeremy Taylor, through Browne and Hobbes and Clarendon, moves on. Even the Restoration comedy, morally corrupt and dramatically imitative though it be, has yet its part in the movement; for the literary quality of Congreve, and in a lesser degree of Vanbrugh, is of high excellence, and the former was the first to teach the English writer how to impart somewhat of that point and balance to the prose epigram in which he may approach, though the genius of our language forbids him to rival, the French. The services of Dryden to English letters in every department were inestimable. He not only gave order and regularity to the heroic couplet, but he left behind him a more mobile and elastic prose than he found; and both by the style and matter of his literary dissertations he may claim to have been the father of the modern science of criticism. He resumes the literature of the later seventeenth century both in prose and verse, and he wielded over the former the sovereignty which passed at his death into the hands of as many partitioners as did the empire of Alexander. Within little more than a dozen years from his decease the sceptre of poetry was as firm in the grasp of Pope as it had ever been in his own; but many writers of high merit, among whom the names of Swift and Addison are the most distinguished, were the successors to his fame in prose.

The fortunes of this latter portion of his bequeathed work were more evenly prosperous, and ultimately not less brilliant, than those of the former. English prose, strengthened by

Swift, refined and purified by Addison, has had to pass through no interval of decline or retrogression between that day and our own, and has proved itself an instrument of equally marvellous reach and power in the hands alike of every great master of fiction, from Fielding and Richardson to even the too negligent Scott, and from Scott to Dickens, Thackeray, and George Eliot ; of every historian, from Hume and Gibbon to Macaulay and Froude ; of every critic and essayist, from Johnson and Goldsmith to Southey and Landor, Lamb and Hazlitt, and from them to Ruskin and Carlyle. English poetry, on the other hand, after being carried through, at no little cost in sincerity of feeling, to the highest possible technical perfection by Pope, was destined to decline in the hands of his innumerable imitators into a lifeless art, a condition from which Gray and Cowper—true poets as they were—were only forerunners of its redemption. It is not till we reach the very threshold of the nineteenth century that a new poetic movement sets in, less potent of immediate influence, but in literary distinction second only to that of the Elizabethan period, and of so much more lasting vitality that it has hardly even yet exhausted its force. The publication of the *Lyrical Ballads* in 1798 was the birth-cry of that new poetic spirit—a spirit part romantic, part mystical, part naturalist—which has transmitted its triple influence from Coleridge and Shelley, from Keats and Wordsworth, to Swinburne and William Morris on the one hand, to Matthew Arnold and his school on the other, and may be regarded as having reached its highest pitch of inspiring power in the poetry of Tennyson, wherein all three of its constituent elements unite.

#### V. ART.

The student of the history of art in England has no such many-threaded narrative to follow out as the explorer of this subject in Italy or even in other less artistically famous Continental countries would find it necessary to trace. England has produced many great works of art, but at no period of her annals has she produced great art-works of many kinds. With substantial accuracy indeed it may be said that until a comparatively recent period of her annals she

produced them only in one kind. Painting and sculpture had elsewhere had a long and glorious history before we meet with the name of any Englishman born which has acquired a right of enrolment beside those of foreign masters in these branches of art. Even the very breath of the Renaissance, which passed over certain other countries like that wind of resurrection which swept the valley of the dead at the summons of Ezekiel, awoke no new artistic life in England. Centuries had yet to pass, and the one great form of art in which Englishmen excelled, even then declining, was to die out altogether, before an English school of painting arose. Fortunate is it for us that the form in question is prominent over all others for the durability of its creations, and that many a majestic monument remains to attest the power and nobility to which English architecture attained.

If, however, the history of our art in its greater and more famous departments has, so to speak, but little lateral extension, yet if we take major and minor art-forms together, the record of its total activities stretches wide, and is of deeply significant bearing on the general narrative of our advance in civilisation. In the pages which we here devote to it we shall endeavour to trace its lineage, as near as may be, in continuous descent from the remotest past. In so doing we shall show how the arts of design began before the beginnings of history, and how the earliest conceptions of architectural grandeur date from the prehistoric builders. We shall show how the Roman invader found means to beautify his place of exile with the work of British craftsmen; and how his rude English successor in conquest developed here into the most laborious of illuminators, the most skilful of embroiderers. We shall note the suggestive importance of the English loom five centuries before the Frenchman or the Fleming came to teach us a more perfect method, and a thousand years before the first spindle turned in Manchester. Later on we shall see how, with the coming of the Norman, the English burgh gave place to the impregnable castle, and how the perishable wooden churches of the Saxon were replaced by Norman stonework, built as for eternity. Or, later still, how a profusion of carving and decoration covered the churches of the day of Anselm and Lanfranc. We shall watch the rise, and follow the decline and fall, of Gothic architecture; its coming, under

the first of the Angevins ; the grace of its springtime under Richard and John and Henry ; its sumptuous decoration under the Edwards ; its grave, autumnal beauty under their successors ; its Indian summer and final eclipse under the Tudors.

Our survey of the development of lay architecture will show its moving along similar, but not parallel, lines. The massive Norman castle—the great seal which William set everywhere on his conquests—outwardly gave little promise of progress. Yet even these stones, cemented with the tears and sweat of the conquered, soon bear witness to the outward movement of material civilisation. New fashions rapidly invade the keep and donjon. The stronghold grows larger ; it becomes commodious ; later it is seen to aim at actual comfort ; finally it approaches something like luxury. The manor-house now begins to compete with it, and in the end successfully, save in those few cases where under the pressure of military discipline the castle has to serve the purpose of an elaborate government fortification. Later on we shall see how, while retaining the old menace of external aspect, it becomes internally a residence not unfitted for civilised man. At length the castellated form entirely disappears, and the country houses built by English magnates show their military descent only in a certain soldierly stateliness. The Renaissance, too, comes in to derange further the old designs, though it must be confessed that in comparison with religious architecture our lay buildings suffered little injury from the new influence.

The art of painting seems to have begun everywhere (except possibly in Egypt) as ancillary to some other art. In England it appeared as the handmaid—and the humble handmaid—of architecture. But England was not singular in this respect ; nor shall we find any proof that in the infancy of art the fresco painters of York or Canterbury were behind those of Tuscany and the Romagna. Though, of course, behind the Italians, they were not more so than were the artists of France and Flanders ; but while those countries suffered nothing worse than an arrest of growth, in England there was actual death. The seed of artistic genius, which in more fortunate lands was alive if dormant, seems to have perished altogether. The long and exhausting

war with France, and the internecine strife of York and Lancaster, were not merely unfavourable to the harvest of art-production; apparently they sterilised the soil. Painting, like Christianity, had a second time to be imported into England.

Sculpture, though nowadays regarded somewhat as the Cinderella of our national art, had rather better fortune, probably because it was more an integral part—indeed, almost a branch—of architecture. It happened, moreover, to be the one form of artistic effort in which Englishmen early displayed what in our modern phrase we call “a feeling for decoration.” The reader will see in the course of these pages how largely it was developed by the Gothic masons in finial and ornament, and how sepulchral sculpture (including portraiture in stone and bronze) assumed an importance which even in our darkest architectural age it never afterwards lost.

The art of painting as we find it in the England of the Tudors came from abroad, and had all the tenderness of an exotic. It struck no roots into our chilly soil. The illustrious artists who were tempted from Italy and Switzerland and the Low Countries by the hope of enriching themselves at the Tudor and Stuart Courts had pupils indeed, and imitators, but neither they themselves nor their disciples succeeded in founding any school, in establishing any tradition. Yet, small and infantile as their influence has been, we shall have briefly to record the English doings of these artistic settlers on our shores, as well as of the comparatively obscure Englishmen who were tempted to emulate their achievements. These were not few, but hardly any of them attained commanding success. Some good miniaturists in the sixteenth century, one great English and one great Scottish portrait-painter in the seventeenth, form a promising beginning, but the promise is not fulfilled. The want of public appreciation, the troubles of the Civil War, the subjection to France, and, above all, the blighting influence of Protestantism in the former century, and of Puritanism its quintessence in the latter, go far to account for the failure, reinforced as they, moreover, were by simple bad luck in the early deaths of artists of ability. The story which we have to tell is full of interest, but not of that



interest which attaches to a phase of national development. That comes later.

Any consecutive history of English-bred art must naturally begin with Hogarth. During his life nearly all our greatest artists were born, and the last of the survivors of the band lived on into the second quarter of the present century. It will be our privilege to summarise, however briefly, the fascinating record of their splendid achievements, and to indicate their hardly less splendid failure. We shall mark, too, that strange phenomenon which seems the abiding note of English effort, that our victories in art, as in war, have mostly been "soldiers' victories," where every man did that which was right in his own eyes. This is true not only of the painters of our age, but also of the men who succeeded them, and of the men of to-day. There have, of course, been movements distinguished by more orderly aims and the effort after a more uniform artistic ideal. The most important of these is still great, if no longer a directly vitalising one; but here, since we are trespassing on the threshold of the present, our survey of English art must be closed.

## VI. TRADE AND INDUSTRY.

And now that the moral, the intellectual, the spiritual factors, in the sum of our modern civilisation have thus been passed in review, it remains only to glance at the physical agencies which have contributed to its growth. We shall have in these volumes to trace the progress of our material prosperity, step by step, and through stage after stage of its advance. We shall have to note the successive utilisation of the various sources of wealth; the development of the corresponding methods of production; the chequered fortunes of our agriculture; the rise and growth, in its later stages so enormous, of our manufacturing industry; the progressive expansion to its present astonishing volume of our external trade. Incidentally thereto, of course, we shall have to render, period by period, an account—for it will be hardly less than that—of the physical well-being of the great body of the English people; to show how it has been affected by causes natural and artificial, by "act of God" or ordinance of man; by laws, in the legislator's literal sense of the word,



and in the economist's figurative use of it; by war, pestilence, or famine, with their depletions of population, arrests of production, and displacements of industries; and last, and most important of all influencing causes, by those applications of man's inventive faculty to his productive work, which by directing the stream of industry into new channels and leaving others bare and dry, may within a few score years reverse the work of ages, and not only transform the external aspect of a society, but almost create a new type of national character.

It is on this side of the subject that the history of a nation's industry is so intimately bound up with the history of its manners; and though for convenience of treatment the two subjects have of course been severally dealt with in the body of the work, I need make no attempt to separate them here. The external aspects of the life of any people—their manners and customs, their social institutions and usages, their habits in short (from the broadest down to the narrowest sense of that word, from the most important observances of social intercourse down to the very cut and colour and material of costume), are, if not in exclusive, in obviously closer dependence upon the character of their industries than on any other cause. No sooner has colonisation or conquest laid the bases of civil society; no sooner does the war with Nature, or with human rivals, for territorial possession come to an end, and the colonist or the conqueror settle down to live of his labour, than a process of mutual interaction between industries and habits sets in, the resultant of which defines the particular line of development along which such a society must advance in the arts of life. Soil and climate, opportunity and instinct, combine to direct a people to one kind of industry or another; but the industry once chosen, and any others subsequently added to it, leave an ever deepening mark upon their character. Our own early history supplies one of the most notable of all the illustrations of this truth in the tale of Saxon and Dane. The sea rovers who descended upon Britain in the fifth century had before the close of the eighth been transformed into the race of home-keeping landsmen in whom another breed of maritime marauders found at first an almost defenceless prey.

In the order of man's advance towards civilisation, agricultural or pastoral industry was everywhere no doubt his earliest form of settled labour. The plough-handle or the crook was the first implement to his hand after the hunting-spear. Undoubtedly he must have tilled the earth before he mined it; yet, inasmuch as the most primitive form of agriculture originates in the immediate personal needs of the cultivator, and for a long time seeks no other object than the satisfaction of those needs through more or less rude processes of local barter, its beginnings may leave no deep trace upon the history of a people. It is not until a race is far enough advanced to become producers for the purposes of exchange against the products of other and more advanced communities that their industries find their way into written record. In the case of countries more favoured by climate than Britain their earliest trade with the foreigner which history has to record is usually in the surface products of the earth—in corn or wine, in the yields of the olive-grove or the orchard. But it is as a producer of minerals that our group of islands is first met with in the pages of the historian and the geographer; and a variety of evidence goes to show that its inhabitants must have possessed the art of working in metals before the Roman occupation. The country, however, which had been marked out by destiny to become the greatest manufacturer in the world was slow in taking its place among the manufacturing nations of Europe. Other peoples whom the English race have since far outstripped were ahead of us for many centuries, and throughout that period England existed mainly as a producer of raw material, and as, what she still pre-eminently remains, an emporium of exchange. In Roman and Saxon, as in later times, our great capital was a notable centre of international commerce, and to the Danish invasion and the rule of the Danes we owe the rise and growth of the trading ports on our eastern coasts. It is before the fall of the Danish rule that the merchant, asked in the Old English Dialogue "What do you bring to us?" replies, "I bring skins, silks, costly gems, and gold, besides various garments, pigments, wine, oil, and ivory, with brass and copper and tin, silver and gold, and the like."

It was as a trader that England first began her career of prominence in the history of the world; but long after she

had become a producer far beyond her own needs she still remained, so to speak, at the first stage of production. The great wool-producing country of the Western world, she was for long dependent mainly on the demand of the Flemish looms for the exchange of this product, and it was not till the reign of Edward III. that an attempt was made to promote the manufacture in this country. But here, of course, we approach a subject of such magnitude that in a few prefatory observations of this kind it is impossible to do more than touch upon it. It is one upon which the two sections of agriculture and commerce come in contact with each other, and it forms a main element in that great question which will fall to be dealt with in the economic department of these volumes—namely, the reciprocal action and reaction of trade upon industry, and of industry upon trade.

Other, however, than economical factors will, of course, have to be taken into account. Influences wielded by legislation and royal policy, such as are particularly noticeable in the thirteenth century; the shock of great physical calamities, such as made memorable the succeeding age; civic movements and developments, active throughout both these periods and thereafter—these and many other forces have to be reckoned with in tracing the vicissitudes of our industrial and commercial history, even as far down as the accession of Elizabeth, while with the sudden outburst of the exploring and colonising spirit which marked that glorious era a new chapter opens in the history of our commerce. Then comes the long pause of the seventeenth century, when the eye of England, no longer sweeping the horizon of the outer world, as under the Tudor princes, turned inwards, and the adventurer-race of the preceding age seemed absorbed in the work, to use an expressive French phrase, of “making their souls,” and,—what has been known to accompany that process in private families,—fighting among themselves. Upon this follows the Revolution and the exhausting European war which succeeded it; then that revival and growth of British trade under the peaceful policy of Walpole which carries us well-nigh to the middle of the seventeenth century; then the new Empire won for us, and the world-wide market thrown open to us, by the elder Pitt;

until at last we are in sight of those epoch-making inventions and discoveries which finally settled the future of England as a manufacturing nation, and started her on the career which she has pursued to such mighty issues down to the present day.

Thus in the first of the periods above referred to we shall have to trace the history and to record the great industrial change which, beginning in the reign of Henry III., continued with increasing energy during the reign, and through the legislation, of his son—a change which, in the domain of agriculture, created out of the masses of rural bondsmen a new class of tenant farmers, and, in the department of commerce, was attended by a rapid increase in the wealth. Passing on to the next century we shall see how the progressive and hitherto peaceful development of that new agrarian system, which based on the contract of landlord and tenant, and worked on that of hire and service, had replaced, or was replacing, the old feudal relations of tenure and feudal organisation of labour, received a sudden check from the terrible national visitation known as the Black Death; and how from the widespread mortality which attended that scourge, and the consequent depletion of the cultivator class which was caused by it, there followed—through successive stages of harsh legislation, popular revolt, and executive repression which left untouched the root of evil—an enforced diversion of productive effort on the part of the owners of the soil, which in the end revolutionised the whole agricultural system of this country. Through the century which follows, a period of exhausting warfare abroad and at home, we shall trace the continued operation of the same causes in the still prevailing distress and discontent of those rural labouring classes whom this great agricultural change above referred to, with its incidents of eviction and dispossession, the consolidation of small holdings, the expansion of pasture land, and contraction of arable, was throwing in ever increasing number out of employment. To these classes the word “enclosure” became as hateful as, in its supposed portent of peril to their means of subsistence, was the word “machinery” to the urban artisan of three centuries later; and their fears found vent like his in outbreaks of violence and riot. Still onward through its political and social consequences shall we pursue

the record of this slow and painful re-adjustment of agricultural labour to its new conditions, till the more urgent of the sufferings inflicted in the process are alleviated by the Elizabethan poor-law, while agriculture, now beginning to reap the benefits incidental to its change of method, re-absorbs much of the surplus labour which had been flung off at the commencement of the transition period, and a sensible growth of manufacturing industry, accompanied by a far greater expansion of commerce, comes finally to complete the relief of the unemployed.

English commerce, born to a less chequered career and to milder vicissitudes than agriculture, has been all this while, "without haste but without rest," maintaining its progress. Already, as has been remarked, a striking feature in the general life of the country many centuries before its great manufacturing industries came into existence, and while some of its richest natural products were still unexploited, English commerce never loses, nor even seems to suffer any temporary decline of, importance during the ensuing ages. Neither conquest nor change of dynasty does other than increase it. Under Angevin as under Norman, under Dane as under Saxon, the external trade of England is conspicuous for its steady growth. The history of its internal trade is bound up with the stirring narrative of the struggle for municipal liberties, with the rivalry of the guilds, and with the less eventful but no less interesting annals which record the rise and progress of the English towns. With the story of our commerce in both its branches another subject will be found inseparably intertwined. Side by side with the English trader marches for a thousand years and upwards the English legislator—a travelling companion whose attentions were not always disinterested, and even when they were, were too often embarrassing if not injurious to their object. The record of their long journey together reveals an alternation of attempts on the part of the legislator now to protect the trader, now to enrich the king or the community at his expense, and in each case with either manifest damage to one or with doubtful advantage to the others. Through chapter after chapter of the Statute Book—in fiscal, sumptuary, and protective laws of all descriptions; in enactments for the promotion of one form of production and the repression of another, for the

encouragement of an export here and the prohibition of an import there; in laws against forestalling, regrating and engrossing; in an endless series of "Statutes of the Staple"; in incessant attempts to fix the prices of goods and regulate the wages of labour—the incidents of this secular companionship of trade and legislation are plainly traceable; and though the interference of the latter with the former becomes rarer in its occurrence and less disturbing in its character as we approach our own times, it is not till close upon the middle of the present century that the ill-assorted fellow-travellers finally part company.

But the long story of their intercourse affords perhaps the most striking illustration of national progress. It is in this very record of the innumerable obstacles against which English industry and trade have had to fight their way, that their unconquerable vitality finds its strongest proof. And the national qualities by virtue of which alone could these obstacles have been overcome are, of course, equally well attested by the victory. It is through the tenacity of their life and the energy of their operations that, in the teeth of many if not all those adverse influences which Macaulay enumerates in a famous passage, the prosperity of the country has steadily grown. It is through these causes, as he has said, that "the national wealth has, during at least six centuries, been almost uninterruptedly increasing; that it was greater under the Tudors than under the Plantagenets; that it was greater under the Stuarts than under the Tudors; that, in spite of battles, sieges, and confiscations, it was greater on the day of the Restoration than on the day when the Long Parliament met; that, in spite of maladministration, of extravagance, of public bankruptcy, of two costly and unsuccessful wars, of the pestilence and the fire, it was greater on the day of the death of Charles II. than on the day of his Restoration"; and (to add a last and most marvellous chapter of all to the history which Macaulay here breaks off) that, in spite of the loss of the American Colonies and the exhausting drain of a war of more than twenty years' duration, it was greater on the day of the meeting of the Congress of Vienna than on the day of the accession of George III.

## VII. MANNERS.

Concurrent everywhere with the growth of a nation's wealth is its advance in refinement of manners and its progress in what are called the arts of life. A primordial instinct of human nature insures this concurrence and maintains it. It is guaranteed by the universal tendency of mankind to save labour and procure leisure, to diminish pain, to increase pleasure, to avoid discomfort. The surplus of national wealth which is applicable to this purpose may be differently applied in different ages (and the history of manners is to a large extent the history of its variations), but on the whole the sum of the material luxuries of a nation and of the appliances for obtaining them increases in direct proportion to the amount of this disposable surplus. It is only to a partial and imperfect view of the manners of the past—to an eye that concentrates its gaze upon some single feature of the national life instead of surveying it as a whole—that any doubt of this could be possible. Extravagance of outlay on costume, on domestic establishment or personal retinue, or on other like matters, may attract to itself so much of the effective desire for material pleasure in any given historical period, that if we were to contemplate it alone we should form an altogether false idea of the contemporary standard of luxury. A man of fashion, for instance, in the time of Richard II. might spend as much as £200 on the "clothes he stood upright in," while a dandy of the Victorian era attires himself to perfection for little more than as many shillings. The personal attendants of a great noble under the Tudors would often outnumber twentyfold the average domestic staff of a duke of to-day. But the food and lodging, the lighting and warming, the household comforts and conveniences, the medicine and surgery, the means of communication and locomotion, at the disposal of the fourteenth century courtier, or the sixteenth century grandee, were of a rudeness which far more than made up for their luxury of apparel or the pomp and circumstance of their lives. A prince or a peer of the Angevin period might wear velvet and ermine on his back, but he had rushes under his feet; his hall might be grand in proportions and rich in decorations, but its primitive illuminants made little more than darkness visible; his meal might be served



up to him on costly dishes, but he fed himself with his fingers.

Yet the full extent of the contrast between the civilisation of the present and that of the past would never be realised if we were to confine our attention to the change of manners which has taken place among the richer orders of society alone. In the famous chapter of Macaulay's History which has been already quoted, the historian compares the condition of the labouring class at the time at which he was writing with that of the nobility and gentry, of the higher professions, and of the magnates of commerce at the end of the seventeenth century, and shows how well provided were the former with many of those equipments and agencies of civilised life which the latter altogether lacked, or which they enjoyed in far scantier measure. He shows how, as regards the facilities of travel, the opportunities of communication, the amenities of social intercourse, the protection of life and property, the securities for the preservation of health, the appliances for the cure of disease, the position of the humblest members of the community in his own time was preferable to that of the wealthiest citizen of the age of which he writes. But the interval between his own time and ours has had a history hardly less remarkable. The vast development of production which has followed upon the economical liberation of commerce and industry, with its corresponding increase in the purchasing power of money and cheapening of the necessities of life, has, no doubt, been the principal cause of progress. But the ever-widening conquests of science, the immense extension of the means of communication by steam and electricity, and the enlightening and humanising influences of education, have all contributed in their respective degrees to the same happy result. It is due to the combined operations of all these causes that that chapter of the social history of England, which commenced about the middle of the present century, has, in point alike of the material gains which it records, and the intellectual interest which it inspires, so immeasurably surpassed all previous periods in the annals of our nation.

So rapid, so almost breathless, has been the rate of our material progress during the present generation that it has, more naturally, perhaps, than reasonably, provoked



utterances of disappointment from those who, like the divine or the philosopher, are mainly concerned with other than the material aspects of human life. Such persons, however, too often begin by demanding more from what is known as Progress than it can be justly expected to yield, and then go on to arraign it for its failure to satisfy their excessive requirements. Perpetually reminding us that "Man cannot live by bread alone," they seem to think that this entitles them to deride the cultivation of wheat. No doubt there is truth in their complaint that our increased and increasing mastery over the physical world has been attended by no corresponding—that is, by no proportionate—elevation of the moral and spiritual faculties of human nature. But the truth is one which they systematically exaggerate. It is true that man as a moral and spiritual being changes little and changes slowly in the course of ages, and that in these respects the reaction upon him of his material surroundings is very gradual and very slight. It is untrue to say, as those we speak of are apt to say, that as a moral and spiritual being man changes not at all, and that the reaction of his surroundings upon his character is *nil*. The Englishman of the nineteenth century, no doubt, differs far less in his inner nature than in the outward circumstances of his social life from the Englishman of the fifteenth or even of the eleventh century; but still he differs; and the changing circumstances of his social life from age to age have played their part with other causes in producing this difference. Let us not fear to add that it is on the whole a difference for the better, and that to the pessimist, therefore, who contends that the Englishmen of the future will not differ, or only differ for the worse, from the Englishman of to-day, we are entitled to say that the burden of proof rests upon him. It is for him to show cause for believing that the path which throughout the centuries has on the whole led upwards will hereafter stretch for ever over a monotonous plateau, if not descend to lower levels. It is for him to rebut the presumption, forced upon us by many examples in the past, that no apparent arrest of the progress of the human race is more than temporary, and that its general onward movement is as little affected, even by brief intervals of actual retrogression, as the inflowing tide is affected by the reflux of the broken wave. In all periods of man's history this

mistake of the casual and transitory for the uniform and permanent has been made by one age to be discovered by the next; and those among us who are apt to despond of our future can safely assure themselves that the Englishmen of a century hence, though possibly enough they may be occupied with their own misgivings, will at any rate smile at ours.

H. D. TRAILL.

# SOCIAL ENGLAND.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### ENGLAND BEFORE THE ENGLISH.

THE history of the most important part of the world is the history of the migration of nations from east to west. From the dawn of history to our own time we see nations moving westwards.

O. M. EDWARDS.  
*Celtic Britain.*

Rome placed boundary marks and built boundary walls, but its power waned, and the nations passed on as before. Until the fifteenth century, when a daring Genoese ventured out into the ocean to discover a new world, our islands lay on the confines of the earth, beyond which no man could go. It was the most adventurous nations that reached it, and they only. It became the home of those who stopped because they had reached the furthest limit of migration.

The first wave of immigrants that reached Britain—for the primæval people of the island will be dealt with later—was a wave of men of short

*The Peopling of  
Britain.*

stature and of swarthy countenance, whose purest descendants may be seen among the miners of the Rhondda Valley or in the quadrangles of Jesus College at Oxford. We call them Iberians, and we suppose that they came from the deserts of the East—from Arabia and from Egypt. Many imagine a resemblance between their faces and the faces of men depicted on Assyrian stones and Egyptian mummies, and suppose they followed the northern shore of the Mediterranean in their journey westwards.

The second wave we call the Celtic wave. The Celt was taller than the Iberian, of fair complexion, and had reached a higher stage in the development of civilisation—having

reached the marriage stage, and having domesticated every creature that we regard as domestic now, except, perhaps, the pig and the bee. The Celts journeyed, probably, through Central Europe. They seem to have come to the British Islands in two divisions: the Gaelic Celt was followed by the Brythonic Celt. The language of the Gaelic Celt still survives in the Isle of Man, in the west of Ireland, and in the north-west and north of Scotland. The language of the Brythonic Celt is still the language of Brittany and of Wales; it was the language of the district between the Dee and the Clyde eight centuries ago; Cumberland shepherds still count their sheep in Welsh; and it was only during the last century that it died in Cornwall. The Gael passed over into Ireland, and then, finding only the boundless ocean ahead of him, he turned back. On the western coast of Britain, from St. David's to Dumbarton, he found the Brythonic Celt following in his footsteps; and the early history of Wales and of Scotland consists of the history of the struggle between these kinsmen.

At the time of the birth of Christ, Celtic tribes were following each other from the Continent into Britain, and the closest connection existed between the people on each side of the Channel. At the same time the conquests of Julius Cæsar and the extension of the power of Rome had checked the advance of the tribes who were pressing onwards from the east and south-east. Rome had arisen in the path of the migrating nations, and the pressure on Britain became less. The tribes began to settle down, and the tribal king was beginning to develop into something like a national sovereign, with his capital on the eastern shore, from which he exercised a sovereignty that became more vague and shadowy as one travelled westwards to the country of the unconquerable Silures.

Rome built its walls and constructed its roads across the old paths of the Celt and of the Iberian; the villas of new rulers arose by its road-sides, and flourishing towns around its garrisons. But it could only stop the migration for a time. Other tribes—the Teutonic tribes—were gathering beyond its northern boundaries, and preparing to pour southwards and westwards by land and sea. Finally these burst through the defences of the Roman Empire, and Britain saw

new invaders: first came the Teutonic Angles and Saxons, and then came the Teutonic Normans.

From the earliest times to the beginning of the twelfth century, invasion after invasion broke over Britain, and each invasion brought a new class. During four hundred years, from A.D. 50 to 450, the Romans prevented or checked the migration, and taught the restless tribes the ways of fixed habitation and consolidated government. When the Roman Empire fell, its ideas remained in the countries which had once formed part of it. And when the Teutonic invaders forced their way into any of the Roman countries they were conquered by Roman ideas. The West Saxon chieftain, after ruthlessly destroying the Roman city and temple in the south of Britain, eventually bedecked himself with the insignia of Roman sovereignty, and took the title of the Roman governor as his own. The Norman pirate, after devastating every river-mouth on the Atlantic side, became the defender of France and the final consolidator of Britain. The leaders of the old migration became the defenders of the newly-formed countries. In the last invasion of England, when a Norse descent was made upon the isle of Anglesey, at the beginning of the twelfth century, the defenders as well as the invaders were Normans. The Norman earl of Roman Chester, with its Roman traditions and *judices*, defended his country against invasion, as his Roman predecessor had done six hundred years before. Though the Norwegian Magnus was able to send an arrow into Hugh of Shrewsbury's eye, the last invasion was beaten off. But traces of the successive invasions remained in the classes into which the inhabitants of Britain were and are divided—the highest class representing the latest invaders. Having related so much political history, let us look at the social side of early British history.

Before the rise of the Roman city in Britain, the characteristic institutions of the island were what we may call, for the sake of distinction **Social Organisation.** and for the sake of brevity, the free tribe and the bond village. It is the relations between the tribesmen and the villagers that explain social British history before the Roman conquest.

Tribe and village represent two races, different in origin, in language, in character, in institutions. The free Aryan tribesman thought that he himself had come from the east,

from the land of the rising sun, while he regarded the short, dark, Iberian villager as one who had emerged out of some dim, mysterious western land, a land on the confines of the nether regions of the earth. There are traditions of the struggle between the two languages; and though the Iberian eventually forgot his own language and learnt a Celtic one, he has given his acquired language peculiarities which are still a continual stumbling-block to Welsh grammarians. The tribesman was tall and fair-haired, hospitable and generous, fond of war and of the chase; the villager was cunning and deceitful, adept in handicraft and magic, rarely venturing far from his hill-side or hill-top home. The tribesman ruled, with all his pride of race; the villager, who could boast of no ancestry, served or paid tribute.

Let us first look at the tribe. It is a community of free heads of families, united together for purposes of defence, of law, and of tillage. The homesteads are scattered along the borders of the woods, between the pasture-lands and the hunting-grounds. Each homestead is large enough to contain a whole family in its one room. It is a square or a round edifice, built of unhewn or roughly hewn trees placed on end, with a roof of interlaced boughs, covered with rushes or with turf. In the middle of the floor the family fire burns, and the members of the family sit round it, along the side of the room, upon a bed made of rushes and covered with hides or coarse cloth. Upon this bed, around the fire which continued to burn by night as well as by day, the members of the family had the right to sit at meal-times and to lie at night. At meal-times large platters, containing oatmeal cakes, meat, and broth, would be placed on the rushes and green grass which intervened between the family bed and the family fire. At nightfall the fire would be renewed, and the privileged circle—from grandfather to grandson—lay with their feet towards it. The land belonged to the family; the right of sitting in the circle round the family hearth and the right of reposing in the family bed carried with them the tribesman's right to his acre strips, his share of the waste, and his privilege of hunting the wild boar and the wolf and the deer in the family hunting-grounds.

The family remained united to the third generation. When the head of the household died, his youngest son took

his place as the master of the old homestead, and the remaining brothers built other homesteads on the family land. When all the brothers died, there was a second division of the family land among first cousins; and finally, on the death of all the first cousins, the second cousins might divide the family land for the third time. Then the old family was regarded as having broken up into new families—all anxious, however, to remember their common descent.

All crime was crime against the family: it was the family that was regarded as having committed the crimes of its members; it was the family that had to atone, or to carry out the blood-feud. In time, money payments were fixed as commutations for injury; but, even as late as the twelfth century, Welsh blood-feuds were fought out to the death, and whole families rose at the command of the master of the household to pursue the murderer.

Every free tribesman had the right of bearing arms, and the young men of the tribes were often engaged, under a chosen leader, in warlike expeditions against their neighbours. While so engaged, no homestead belonging to their own tribe could be closed against them. In time this privilege became a dangerous one, for brothers quarrelled about their shares in the divisions of the family land, and a turbulent tribesman, when driven from his family, could gather an army of followers and live upon the country. A legend, written in its present form in the thirteenth century, tells how a prince, jealous of his brother's position as head of the household, called together an army of foster-brothers and dependents—an army that soon became the terror of the country. Some of his pursuers are described as entering a house which may well be taken as the ruined homestead of an old free family. They saw an old homestead, so the legend runs, black and upright, and from it there came a great smoke. The floor was uneven and miry, with holly boughs spread over it. When they came to the entrance they saw that the family seats around the inside of the homestead were dusty and poverty-stricken, and the smoke which arose from the fire could hardly be borne. They sat around the hearth, while their barley-cakes were being made; and they tried to sleep in the old family bed—a bed of boughs and straw, covered with a coarse cloth of British manufacture. One of them, however, slept on an enchanted

yellow calf-skin, probably the privileged place of the old master of the household, and saw passing before him, in review, the old gods and heroes of his country, transformed into Arthur's knights.

Subject to the free tribal communities were the villagers—the *taeog* of later Welsh law—quite distinct from the tribal slaves. The characteristics of the villagers, whose descendants are called “villeins” in the thirteenth century laws, were their communism and their subjection. Probably they were at first a totemistic community, and their totems may still survive in the local nicknames of Celtic localities—such as the pigs of Anglesey, or the goats of Arvon. Land belonged equally to all, son and stranger alike. In later times there could be no escheat on the failure of heirs, for no heir was recognised save the whole community. The land was tilled in common, and its produce was common property. These bond communities were, doubtless, non-Aryan; and their name remained in proverbs as a term of reproach when the distinction between them and the tribesmen had long been forgotten.

When subjected to the Celtic tribesmen, their land was divided among the villeins equally, without any reference to kinship. They were not allowed to bear arms; their property was theoretically regarded as that of their conquerors; they could not rise into an equality with the tribesmen, by learning, or manufacture, or trade, and it was impossible to enter into a free tribal family by marriage, or to become the head of a new free kindred.

Gradually, however, the conditions of tribesman and villager became assimilated; and it is this assimilation that accounts, if not for the rise of the tribal king, at least for the increase of his power. The tribal king was at first, perhaps, a purely military leader; but his position became perpetuated, even in times of peace, because of the presence of subjugated communities. The villein lands were divided, when the periodical divisions came, by the tribal lord's officer, and not, as was the case with the tribal lands, by the owners themselves. The governing of the subject people was the tribal chief's source of strength, as well as his duty. By them his dwelling-place was built or repaired; by them his table was furnished; by them his dogs and slaves were maintained. Gradually he distanced his

**Political  
Organisation.**



fellow heads of families in wealth and in power, and the free land of the tribe as well as the geldable land of the villeins came under tribute to him. The two communities—family and communistic—were finally united in one commot, under the jurisdiction of a lord and his officers.

When Julius Cæsar had conquered Gaul, refugee kings came from the isle of Britain to implore his help.

Many of the numerous tribal kings were in danger from the growing power of some ambitious tribe and its king. The districts of the headwaters of the Nen and the Ouse were occupied by the Catuvelauni, whose able king, Cassivelaunus, seems to have reduced the tribes of the south-east of the island under his own sway. Julius Cæsar tried to destroy the power of this king by protecting the kings of the tribes he had subjugated, especially Mandubratius, king of the Trinobantes. The encroachments of the Catuvelauni did not cease; and, by the time of the Claudian conquest in A.D. 43, nearly a hundred years after Cæsar's departure, they seem to have established a kind of shadowy right over the whole of Southern Britain. The tribes under their sway were probably divided into two groups—the tribes of the plains of the south-east, and the tribes of the mountains of the west and north. These two confederacies occupied the lands which, after the Roman conquest, became respectively Lower and Upper Britain. Cunobelinus, "the radiant Cymbeline," had died before the coming of the Romans, and his kingdom was ruled by his two sons, Caractacus (properly Caratacus) and Togodumnus. Aulus Plautius wrested the eastern portion from the sons of Cymbeline; Togodumnus fell, and Camulodunum, Cymbeline's capital, was taken. The kingdom of the sons of Cymbeline was the more easily conquered on account of the disaffection of the subject tribes. These tribes soon found that the Roman yoke was no lighter than that of Cymbeline and his sons. The Romans established a colony of veterans at Camulodunum, and each tribal revolt was sternly and speedily put down. Caractacus fled westwards, and took the command of the Silures and other western tribes that had, perhaps, acknowledged his father's rule. When the Silures were defeated in battle by Orosius, Caractacus passed to the Brigantes of the north, to organise another opposition in addition to that of the still unconquered Silures. The submission of the Brigantes and the capture of Caractacus put

**The Roman  
Conquest.**

an end to all unity among the British tribes, and the Roman conquest of the island became a comparatively easy task. When Julius Agricola came in the summer of 78 to organise the conquered tribes, he found that the only opposition he need meet was that of some isolated British tribes. Agricola's son-in-law tells us that the Britons were once under kings, but that in his time they were divided into factions and parties. It was the greatest advantage of the Romans that the tribes could no longer act in concert.

Between 78 and 450 the Romans introduced into Britain a unity of their own. The island is divided  
**Conquered Britain.** geographically into mountainous west and flat east—the scenes of the later and earlier struggles of Caractacus. But the fortresses which the Romans built along the valleys of the Severn and the Dee to protect the frontiers of their earlier conquests soon became flourishing and prosperous cities as well as the homes of the legions of the west. Before Britain was thoroughly Latinised, however, it was attacked by the new nations who were threatening the whole length of the northern boundary of the empire. For purposes of defence against the tribes who attacked the eastern shore and the northern wall, Britain fell apart into its old natural divisions, north-west and south-east, under the *Dux Britanniarum*, who ruled over the two Britains. The eastern province was conquered by Teutonic invaders between 450 and 600; the western province, though divided into the three districts of Cornwall and Wales and Strathclyde, by the battles of Deorham and Chester, remained independent. Here the old tribal wars began anew, and some powerful tribal king was ever trying to get himself acknowledged as the successor of the Duke of the Britains. In the east the British tribes were merged in the conquering Teutonic tribes, and among them also the memory of the Roman sovereignty remained. The title of Bretwalda, applied to some of the more important English tribal kings, is simply a translation into English of the title *Dux Britanniarum*. Throughout the Middle Ages the dream of British unity lives in chronicle and romance, and Arthur's crown was supposed to exist at Carnarvon until the Plantagenet conqueror took it away in 1284.

But, however affected by ideas of imperial unity, the oldest tribal divisions still exist. Dialect and traditions still

show that the division into shires and dioceses is based upon the old division into tribes. The tribal king amalgamated his free tribe and his subject communities; Cassivelaunus and Caractacus aimed at subjecting the tribal chief to an island king; the Roman introduced a still wider conception of sovereignty—subjecting kings to the emperor, as each king had subjected tribal lords. The first struggle, however, has left more lasting effects than the last; in Celtic portions of modern Britain there are traces of the old antipathy between tribesman and villager, while the rule of the Roman has been forgotten even where his villa and his storied gravestone remain.

Briefly to recapitulate what has been written, the beginnings of our social history may thus be summarised:—

When the Romans invaded Britain in 54 B.C. and 43 A.D., they found a great tribal king trying to subdue other tribes. In 54 B.C. they found Cassivelaunus extending his sway over the eastern portion of the island; in 43 A.D. they found that Caractacus had some shadow of sovereignty over even the Silures of the west. How had the tribal kings arisen?

**Summary.**

The people of Britain had come in two waves. First the short, dark Iberian came; then came the mighty Celt who conquered him. The two peoples existed side by side, with very different social characteristics, and the Iberian communities remained subject to the leader of the invading Celtic tribe. Hence the leader became very powerful—became a king among his own people.

The Celtic tribes were not at peace among themselves. New invading tribes were ever coming, with better weapons. In a condition of incessant war, it was possible for one tribal king to become powerful enough to subject the others. It was against the encroachments of a great king that minor kings appealed to the Romans, and the Romans came.

The Roman destroyed, for the time, the power of tribal chiefs, and united the southern part of Britain under his own rule, as a part of a wider empire. The Celtic tribe and the Iberian community remained, however, when the Roman was forced to depart. The later history exhibits, in various forms, a struggle between the old tribal independence and the traditions of Roman unity.

The social condition of Britain in British times is explained by this political history. The lowest class, a class subjected to all invaders, was composed of the first inhabitants of Britain—the so-called Iberian, with his dark Druidism and communal life. Above the Iberians we get the Celtic tribesmen, united in families and tribes, and jealous of their privileges. Above the Celtic tribesmen were the kings, who, owing to political reasons, distanced their fellows. And in time even they were subjected to the Romans, whose “red tunic” was regarded as a sign of nobility long after their departure. When these classes had once been formed, Druidism forged chains of iron for each subject class. In the world to come, as in Britain, the slave was never to be free from his master. New invasions and higher classes came, old social history repeated itself with weary monotony until the time came when the levelling influence of two widely different agencies—religion and military invention—was to bring a new social era into being.

ON Britain, as upon the other neighbours of the great empire,

**F. T. RICHARDS.** Roman influence began to tell even before  
**Roman Britain.** Roman arms. It crossed frontiers in a  
**A.D. 48-410.** thousand forms. Now a slave escaping from

his master, and, aware that within the empire there was no safety for him, fled to the barbarians, taking with him some sparks of the civilisation which he had renounced. Sometimes Roman merchants pushed over the border and risked their goods and even their lives in the pursuit of new markets. Traffic went to and fro across the boundary. Sometimes bold foreigners passed within the dominion of the emperors, on business or for mere curiosity, and came home dissatisfied with the simple ways in which they had grown up. Contending parties among the barbarians looked for Roman support, courted it by assuming Roman ways, and invited Roman interference. Even Cæsar found that part of the island which lay nearest to the Continent the most polished; and in all the above ways the Roman civilisation, as it spread in Gaul, must have begun to influence Britain from the moment when Cæsar retired from its shore. It is probable that South Britain made no inconsiderable strides in development

during the interval between the second landing of Cæsar (B.C. 54) and the conquests of Claudius' generals (beginning A.D. 48). The Britons of Tacitus are no longer the downright savages of Cæsar's narrative. London, of which the latter makes no mention, is, in the year 61 A.D., a town "crowded with merchants." Coins were struck by British chiefs, bearing Latin legends. Even diplomatic intercourse and some exchange, perhaps, of friendly services had taken place with the Roman government. The chiefs set up offerings in the great temple of the Capitol. The broken marbles of Angora, which still bear fragments of the record made by the Emperor Augustus of his own reign, tell how Dumnobellaunus and another British prince fled to him for help. Some years later, when a Roman fleet was shattered by a storm in the North Sea, the petty chiefs of our island sent home those soldiers or sailors who were cast away on the British coasts. We may suspect that they all wished to stand well with their great neighbour, that they aspired to be honoured, while they kept their independence, with the ivory staff, and the embroidered robe, and the titles of King and Friend of Rome; and that each hoped that, if subjection must come, he might be the prince through whom the Romans would control his country.

Subjection did come, before many years were passed, and at least one king kept his place under Roman sovereignty. Tiberius Claudius Cogidubnus The Conquest. seems to have united a royal title with the position of a Roman official, and, receiving some districts from the conquerors, he governed for a time the neighbourhood of Chichester (Regnum). But the new government by no means intended to exercise sway through native princes. Its control was direct, and the conquered people had to look up to a Roman magistrate, not to a ruler of their own blood. Peace and security were aimed at by uniform subjection, and, very probably, by disarming the people. But yet the "fierce Britons" never seem to have wanted arms, and, if Rome could control the island with a small force of perhaps thirty to forty thousand men, it was chiefly because she was civilising—or, as some people would have said, corrupting—the nearest parts, while, of the land generally, it was true that feuds set the natives one against another, and made the task of the foreigners easy. "Nothing," says

a philosophic Roman observer, "helps us better against the strongest of the tribes than the fact that they never agree."

The whole of the island, however, was never brought under Roman sway. The north refused to be either conquered or conciliated, and Rome, with all her apparent strength and wealth, found herself in the early centuries of the Christian era too weak to complete the conquest of so remote an island, or too pinched for means to keep on foot the necessary forces. The northern limit of Roman government fluctuated, advancing or receding according to the fortune of war or the spirit of an emperor. But Graham's Dyke, or Grime's Dyke, a line of earthworks running between Kinneil on the Forth and Kilpatrick on the Clyde, indicates the furthest limits which that government ever really undertook to maintain, and the so-called Picts' Wall, or Roman Wall (crossing the neck of land between Carlisle and Newcastle), a stronger work by far, represents the more modest boundary which she was really able to make good.\* (Ireland was never occupied at all.) Within these limits, the famous Roman Peace was supposed to reign supreme. It was upheld by the system of provincial government.

Britain was governed as one province from the time of the conquest down to the year 197 A.D. It was not, that is to say, divided for purposes of administration into distinct territories, as Gaul was divided into four, and Spain into three provinces, but knew only one governor. It belonged to the list of provinces administered by the emperor's deputies, not by officers of the Senate of Rome, and therefore the full title of the governor was *Legatus Augusti pro prætore*. He was understood to have charge of the ordinary administrative business of law, and of the military forces; and by his side stood a *procurator*, charged with financial affairs. The governor need by no means be a mere soldier, rough and illiterate. The recorded careers of many men who rose to provincial governorships show that they saw service of many kinds, and in many lands; and one governor of Britain, about whom we happen to have rather full particulars, received a Greek education at Massalia (the later Marseilles), and took keenly to the study of philosophy. When

**Provincial  
Divisions.**

\* No Roman tomb has been found north of Ardoch, near Stirling.



he received the charge of our island, he interested himself in the elevation and improvement of the natives.\*

After 197 we find Britain divided by the Emperor L. Septimius Severus, between two provinces and two governors. Speaking roughly, the western half of England (not of the whole island) was *Britannia Superior*, and the Eastern was *Britannia Inferior*. Each governor was now called a *Præses*, and the garrison was divided between them. The interests of the State suffered. War could not be so well carried on against the Northern tribes. But it was probably thought unsafe to leave the whole island and the whole force in the hands of one man. D. Clodius Albinus, governor of the united Britain, had been a formidable adversary to Severus; and that emperor, after defeating Clodius, was minded to run no such risk again. But before long there was introduced the policy of breaking up into small and safe—but helpless—units the great provinces which the founders of the empire had organised, and Britain shared the fate of the other countries. We find it under the arrangements of Diocletian, or not long after, divided into four districts or *provinciae*—*Britannia Prima* (which probably answered to England south and west of the Thames), *B. Secunda* (Wales), *B. Maxima Cæsariensis* (perhaps the Midlands), and *B. Flavia Cæsariensis* (the North). Somewhat later still, A.D. 369, the successes of Theodosius against the troublesome land-neighbours of Roman Britain recovered from them what had been Roman territory north of the Picts' Wall, and justified his dividing the north country into two provinces, and naming the further one *Valentia*, in honour of his imperial master Valentinian I. (In what towns the governors of the provinces had their official residences we cannot tell. London is likely to have been the residence of one, and York seems certainly to have been the headquarters of another; but that is as much as we can say.) But it was already found that subdivision of provinces had its drawbacks, and so the four or five governors of the island (of whom some were called *Præsides*, others *Consulares*) were placed under a common superior, a *Vicarius Britanniarum*, who was himself answerable to

\* But, we are told, the Britons in the early part of the period in question complained, "We have now two kings on our shoulders instead of one, a *legatus* and a *procurator*; the former sweeps off our young men into the army, the latter sweeps off our goods."

a great officer on the other side of the British Channel, the *Præfectus prætorio Galliarum*. Finance-officers there were of course also; and, toward the close of our period, when enemies were closing in from all sides upon the Roman world, and Britain had to face something more than its share of them, there were three high military commanders, independent of all the authorities in Britain, but subject to the Gallic *præfectus*. These were the *Dux Britanniarum*, the *Comes Britanniarum*, and the *Comes Litoris Saxonici*—a soldier in charge of the whole south-eastern coast. It was by arrangements more centralised or less cumbrous than this that the older Romans had given peace to the world, and the new scheme was no success.\*

Within the area above described, however, order and all that was essential to good government were secured—at least, during the long interval between the close of the conquest and the coming of the bad days. There were risings among the people, of course, at times, and we must suppose that the walled towns of South Britain, where no open warfare was to be feared (such as Silchester), were meant as places of refuge for such a crisis—unless, indeed, we hold that these fortifications only date from the days when the Roman Peace had broken up. But order was maintained as a rule, and, when taxes were once paid, the people were left pretty well alone. The Government which we have described was all foreign,† external to the people—giving them certain undoubted benefits, such as the English give to India, but making no attempt, as the English do, to elevate the subjects to the power of self-government. There may have been a sort of national council allowed, or even convoked, by the Romans. If so, it was at Camulodunum or Colonia Victricensis (probably Colchester), in connection with the temple where the Emperor Claudius, the first conqueror, was honoured. But we know nothing of such a council, and only think it likely from the analogy of other provinces. We find no Britons rising in the Roman service, except in the army—and not very high there. Nor do we

\* The Saxon shore, which needed to be specially guarded, included all the district which in modern times has been protected by martello towers.

† The Emperor Magnentius, however, is said to have been the son of a British father.



know how far local self-government was allowed to the towns. We can only make a conjectural picture of certain townships managing their own affairs if we take the two or three titles of local officials found here in inscriptions of the Roman period and add to them a great many particulars known of Gallic or other continental towns, but not known to be true of Britain. Town councils there were, miniature senates, for we have inscriptions on stone referring to town councillors of Gloucester, York, and probably Lincoln; but to know more about the administration of a town in a Roman province we should have to cross the Channel.

With the help of what we find there we may imagine the towns of our island controlled by a governing class, or senate, of well-to-do men (*curiales* Roman Towns. or *decuriones*), originally filled up from ex-officials of the town; but later, sitting for life, and transferring the qualification from father to son. When this state of things had come in, the officials were elected by the senate out of its own members, no longer chosen by the people. These magistrates might bear various titles: that of *Duumvir* occurs most often elsewhere. In Britain we can only point to a *censitor*, or *censor*, at Colchester. A council filled up as just described was, of course, quite out of touch with the people. It must be kept up, and could not be abolished, because there was no other class of persons whom the Government could use, and from whom it could raise taxes directly, but it ceased to represent the citizens of the town. In consequence, a new officer was called into being by the Emperor Valentinian I., a *Defensor civitatis* in each town—a champion of the people against the town council. But this was only done in 364, about forty years before the Romans abandoned Britain. A *Sevir* from York is mentioned in one of the inscriptions which have come down to us; and therefore, arguing from the analogy of continental provinces, we may suppose that one or more British towns contained corporations (*collegia*) of *Augustales*, i.e., worshippers of the deified Emperor Augustus. Of such corporations the *Seviri* were the officiating members, serving for a year. But still the worship of Augustus can hardly be supposed to have flourished in Britain as much as in Gaul, seeing that the former country was not conquered till after Augustus' death.

Differences of size and importance were, of course, recognised in speaking of the groups of houses, as we distinguish between a hamlet, a town, and a city. Townships of any size were called *oppida* (as London, then Londinium, or Augusta). More important, perhaps, were *municipia*, a title which had long since ceased to imply the considerable powers of self-government which the word once suggested to a Roman ear. Such was Verulamium (the later St. Albans). The name of "colony" might indicate a real settlement of strangers, as at Camulodunum, where the Romans planted at the very outset a garrison of old soldiers; but it might also be merely an honourable title for a town of importance, as Eboracum (afterwards York), which presently became the chief town of the island, Lincoln (Lindum Colonia), or Glevum (Gloucester). A tombstone of a citizen of Glevum found at Rome makes it probable that Glevum was made a colony by Nerva, *i.e.*, between 96 and 98 A.D. Colonies in the latter sense might, in other parts of the Roman Empire, enjoy more self-government and lighter financial burdens, and they may have had the same privileges in Britain. Some of the Britanno-Roman towns appear to have had mints, distinguished by initials placed on the coins struck; but the coinage was not theirs, not local, but always imperial. The most important of the towns must, in the long run, have been York, the administrative centre and imperial residence, and London, the place to or from which so many routes are marked in an ancient itinerary or road-book of the third or fourth century.

Beside the towns which we have already mentioned, several others rose to importance. It is true that we hear little of them in books, but the remains found on the sites show us, on the best of evidence, what places were centres of population and of luxury. Bath (Aquæ Sulis) was frequented in Roman days—and probably even earlier—for the sake of the waters. The baths attracted visitors whose number and wealth must be measured by the greatness of the preparations made to receive them. The still existing masonry and lead-work show how large and costly was the actual bathing institution.\* Wroxeter (Viroconium or Uriconium) has been called the

\* The great bath, placed in a hall 111 ft. 4 in. long by 66 ft. 6 in. wide, is about 6 ft. 8 in. deep. The bottom measures 73 ft. 2 in. by 29 ft. 6 in. ("The Excavations of Roman Baths at Bath." By C. E. Davis.)

British Pompeii, from the richness of its remains. Cirencester (Corinium or Durocornovium) gained importance perhaps as a meeting-place of roads. In or near several of our old towns, as at the Dorsetshire Dorchester (Durnovaria), the ground is full of Roman interments.

But there were also towns which, though they may have existed in some sense earlier than the Roman conquest, owed their greatness, if not their very existence, to the Roman garrisons which held them. Population naturally gathers to any place where there is a strong and permanent military force. The various wants of the men must be provided for. The officers build themselves cottages in the neighbourhood, and bring servants. Civil officials prefer to reside in spots where they can get society; and, in some cases, the court of the Roman governor would keep the place full of petitioners and litigants. The poor quarter which inevitably grew up outside a great Roman camp was called *Cannabæ* ("The huts") in certain parts of the continent of Europe, and though the name has not yet been found in Britain, the thing itself no doubt existed. Thus, even when the legions and auxiliary forces (*i.e.*, non-Roman troops) were withdrawn from these centres, they still had a population left, and Caerleon-upon-Usk, Chester, and York have probably never ceased to be inhabited since they were Roman stations. At Caerleon (Isca Silurum) \* was long posted the Second Legion (*Legio Secunda Augusta*), a body of, say, 5,000 men, bringing with it various minor bodies of foreign soldiery. At Chester (Deva) stood the Twentieth Legion, which bore the proud title of *Legio Vicesima Valeria Victrix*. At York (Eboracum) the long presence of the Ninth, and afterwards of the Sixth Legion (*Legio Nona Hispana* and *Legio Sexta Victrix*) has left many records cut on stones or stamped on tiles. In these towns, then, were the headquarters, the depôts, the reserves, of the legions which had to keep order in Britain and guard her growing civilisation against the savages beyond the frontier or across the sea. But, of course, the legions could be moved on occasion. They built the two walls across Northumberland and Cumberland and across Scotland, and when the Welsh of the mountains (against whom the camps in Caerleon and Chester were

\* The modern name, Caerleon, is no doubt derived from *Castra legionis*.

originally set up) became less a source of danger than the Picts, the men must often have been marched north. But the soldiers who were regularly in garrison on the Northumbrian wall, and who have very literally left their mark in the neighbourhood, were rather auxiliary forces or irregulars than legionaries or troops of the line. Whether Carlisle (Luguvallium) and Newcastle (Pons Ælius), near the two ends of the wall, owe their rise to resident Roman forces, we cannot tell. In the south and east of Britain it is likely enough that the sites of many coast fortifications were never occupied by man until the Romans saw their strategical importance. To take two examples: Reculver (Reculbium) and Richborough (Rutupiæ) would hardly be worth occupying till there was a regular and considerable arrival of ships from the Continent at the mouths of the strait which then separated the Isle of Thanet from Kent, and which was very probably the ordinary approach to the Thames and London from the south. When such traffic was established it was worth while to guard the two entrances; but Richborough at least has lost its population and is now totally deserted. The withdrawal of the sea would be enough to ruin it, even if no great blow fell on it in war. Reculver has suffered, at a still later time, something very near to total destruction from the encroachment of the sea. Smaller Roman forces, quartered in camps (*castra*) here or there for a time, have left traces of themselves in numerous town and village names, like Chesters, Chester-le-Street, Cherterton, Manchester, Tadcaster, Leicester, and so forth. Norwich (Venta Icenorum), though the name tells no such story, has plain traces of a large and regularly laid-out camp. In some other towns, founded or occupied by Romans, as perhaps at Chester, the crosswise arrangement of the two main streets in the centre may go back to the usages of a Roman camp.

When we look back on what the Britons were when Cæsar invaded and described them, and compare his picture of their miserable state with what we can learn of Roman Britain between, say A.D.

**Advantages of  
Roman Rule.**

100–300, we cannot hesitate to affirm that the conquest was for a long while a good thing for the various races which inhabited our island. Taught to keep the peace toward each other, the quarrelsome tribes were obliged to refer their disputes to a law-court instead of to the issue of battle. Thus internal

peace was secured for many generations, and, as to external peace, Britain was at all events organised and helped in the task of securing that too by the greatest military power of the world. The generations during which the wars of conquest were going on must have suffered almost beyond our power of imagination. The Roman laws of war were stern indeed. But, once the struggle over, new generations grew up with chances of safe life, of comfort, of civilisation, and of careers such as their ancestors could never have dreamed of. The law administered was just and, on the whole, humane. Some of the punishments which it inflicted were such as modern humanity shudders at. We could not bear that any criminals should be thrown to wild beasts or burnt alive. But the Roman system protected the innocent against these or any other dangers; the Roman law of evidence was strict. No one could be condemned without a fair trial or on insufficient proof; no one could be tortured or put to death at the whim of a chief or in the name of religion. Even before the year 79 a Roman official could write that "It is impossible to over-estimate the good service which the Romans have done in putting an end to human sacrifices." Nor did the benefits which Rome conferred on her province end here. She gave it roads, marked out with milestones, and fit, not only for the march of troops or for pack-horse traffic, but for driving too; and she thereby threw the whole country open to trade and intercourse. Such roads as the Romans made could not be kept up by their successors, and our island saw nothing more like them for many a century. The remains of the ruined lighthouse within Dover Castle still point to the Roman care for the interests of navigation. The introduction of theatres gave at once a civilised amusement and a means of education.\* The varied collections in our museums show how far some, at least, of the population had progressed in the direction of polish and external civilisation. Keys and steelyards, roofing tiles and hair-pins, glass bottles and spoons, statues and bells, represent wants and comforts strange to the "savage and shivering Britons," dressed in skins, whom earlier writers knew. The young men of the province who joined the army,

\* Wild and mysterious cries heard in the theatre at Colchester (Camulodunum) were among the signs which presaged the destruction of that city in the bloody rising of the natives in A.D. 61.

whether voluntarily or by compulsion, might be rewarded after perhaps twenty-five years of service with a grant of Roman citizenship for themselves and their wives, and their children would then enjoy full Roman rights. (Among these rights was, as the well-known case of St. Paul shows, immunity from scourging.) Decrees of the emperor granting this favour to the bodies of men who became eligible for it were registered at Rome, and copies of the decree were sent to the place where the men were stationed, and perhaps given to them individually. Four or five such copies have been found in Britain, and though they only refer to companies of non-British troops, raised in other provinces and serving in our island, it is reasonable to suppose that British companies serving abroad were rewarded in the same way. Individuals who seem to have been of British extraction, certainly received the citizenship. Thus Tacitus tells us how one Sulpicius Florus, "of the British forces, lately admitted to citizenship by Galba," was in Rome in A.D. 69, and distinguished himself when Galba fell, by murdering that emperor's adopted son Piso in the street. In any case, the Britons shared in the advantage of the Emperor Caracalla's gift of Roman citizenship to all free-born provincials, in A.D. 212. Henceforth, any position in the Empire was as much open to a Briton as to anyone else.

But it would be absurd to expect the Britons to be aware of all that they were really gaining by their connection with Rome; and there were things to be put in the other scale of the balance—things which hindered the permanent pacification and Romanising of the province. It was not only that the passion for a wild liberty remained strong in many breasts, and that in certain parts of the island it was never overpowered. There was, too, the pressure of taxation, and there was the sense of various grievances which could hope for no redress. At no time was the system of Roman taxation arranged very intelligently, or with great regard to the interests of the taxpayer, and, as the Empire grew older, its incessant struggle to make both ends meet brought with it great misery to the taxpayers, even when the payers were full citizens, which the mass of residents in Britain were not till after A.D. 212. The ordinary taxes of a province fell, of course, upon this island. *Tributum*, or



property-tax, found out all whom it was worth while for a tax-gatherer to visit, while, as the island happened to be a corn-growing country, there was an extra burden to be borne in the form of *annona*, a fixed supply of corn which must be handed over to Roman officials, and which was applied chiefly to provisioning the army in Britain or on the Continent. Admission to the Roman franchise brought with it liability to the further burden of a legacy duty of 5 per cent. (*vicesima hereditatum et legatorum*). Revenue was raised, too, by import duties (*portoria*), levied on imported goods at the harbours where they were landed. To them reference is probably made in a Latin speech, whose author lauds Britain as "a land wealthy from its heavy crops, its rich pastures, its veins of metal, its revenues, and *its many harbours*." There is a story told, too, of the rich philosopher Seneca, that some of his immense wealth was lent to the British "against their will," and that his calling the debt in was among the causes or occasions of the rebellion of Boadicea. This is all we hear about it, but, if we may judge from what happened in some other provinces, Seneca had lent the townships of Britain money at high interest to meet the immediate demands of tax-collectors. As the times grew worse, the weight of taxes rested more and more heavily on the well-to-do members of the town-councils, and, if in various parts of the Continent these sank under their burden, utterly ruined, it is not likely that the British counsellors were much better off.

Yet of taxation as a regular charge the British were patient enough. "Taxes and other burdens," says a contemporary observer, "they bear cheerfully if they are spared actual outrage." It may be believed, though we can hardly say that we know it for certain, that outrageous treatment was rare or accidental. The foundation of the colony of Colchester led to hardship. The original dwellers on the spot lost their land, and the old soldiers embittered the quarrel by taunting the ejected possessors as prisoners and slaves. But such plantations were certainly few, and probably confined to early days. The abominable usage of Boadicea (properly Boudicca) and her daughters is not to be forgotten:—

"Me they seized and me they tortured, me they lashed and humiliated,  
Me the sport of ribald veterans, mine of ruffian violators";

and some of the dealings of the government—or at least of its officials—in the matter of the corn-supply bore a stamp of wanton insolence which made them hard to bear for a high-spirited people, who were, as one of the conquerors said, “reduced to obedience, but not yet to slavery.” That the Britons, who had corn to pay and actually had none in hand, should be compelled to buy it, and buy it at a fancy price, of the officials in order to pay it back immediately to those officials, was an arrangement so clumsy and withal so irritating that we are not surprised to find a wise governor doing away with the system. But his reform came early in the history of Roman Britain, and the story of Boadicea, earlier still, belongs to the period of the invasion and to the lawless deeds of conquest. Time brought law, for conquerors as well as for conquered.

But there were still some permanent grievances, worse than taxation. “We pay,” one of the Britons **British Grievances.** is made to cry in a narrative of the conquest, “We pay a yearly tribute of our bodies.” Every year the conscription carried off a fixed number of the young men to serve in the *auxilia* or “native regiments,” and, as these were employed abroad, no British soldier could be sure of seeing his home and his friends again. The terror of being thus banished, “mixed with other nations and dragged to the ends of the earth,” would weigh with both the men and their parents; and the native chiefs, while there were any, must have reflected with disgust how they were strengthening the Roman forces with all their strongest men. The fleet, too, the *Classis Britannica*, which guarded the coast and kept up communications with the rest of Europe, may have been partly manned in the same way. This fleet was probably created by the Emperor Claudius at the time of his conquest. It was employed by the Governor Agricola to circumnavigate the island, but seems to have been given up before the fall of the Roman dominion; perhaps, united with a Continental squadron, it lost its name. It had stations at Dubrae (the later Dover), Portus Lemanis (Lymne), and Gesoriacum or Bononia (Boulogne.) There is a tablet with figures of ships preserved in the museum at Boulogne which is apparently an *ex-voto* from the crew of a ship of this fleet, the *Triremis Radians*. Bitterly, too, would forced labour



on road-making, or in the mines, be felt; and wherever native simplicity and virtue were conjoined with intelligence, or wherever a Briton had imbibed the best side of the Roman civilisation, there the resentment would be deep against those who were bringing strange vices into the country.

With these causes in our minds, we shall not wonder that there was plenty of discontent among the Britons in at least the earlier generations. The later ones had grown up in their splendid cage, but the earlier men were furious at their position. The free Caledonii, or northern tribes, and the free Irish were a reproach to their conquered neighbours. Moreover, there was the hope of plunder to encourage the subjects if they rose, or the yet unconquered North Britons if they raided into the province. Hence the Roman position was long an anxious one, and the garrison was always on the defensive. The great island was simply held down by foreign troops. The Britons who were enlisted could, it seems, not be trusted fully, for there is no known case of any native force being permanently stationed within the island. We hear rumours of various risings among the rest of the population. Bare hints survive to show us that Yorkshire was a hard region to control, and when we find the Ninth Legion leaving no trace of itself after 108 or 109 in the monumental records at York, where it was stationed (and none elsewhere), we may not unfairly suspect that it had been cut to pieces. It was not for nothing that the great Roman wall from Newcastle to Carlisle was made defensible both ways, so that it could be held no less against the restless subjects within than against the untamed Caledonii without.

But with all this restlessness, time fought on the side of steady and civilised government; and even at an early day the south-east of the island Roman Influence. was reconciled to its position and sought a new outlook by becoming as Roman as possible. The legions could, with safety, be moved away from those parts of the country. The wiser governors favoured the change. They encouraged and helped the Romanising party to decorate the towns with temples, showy market-places, and fine houses; and the leading men among the South Britons were not slow either in taking or in setting the new example. A whimsical

consciousness of the work which the conquerors were doing is shown in the frequency with which the mosaic pavements of Roman villas in England exhibit the device of Orpheus taming the birds and beasts. The Britons were the birds and the beasts, and, if they did not know it, the Romans did. The sons of British nobles were trained up in "liberal studies" and set the fashion to their countrymen. The great number of the inscriptions which have come down to us shows a widespread use or knowledge of writing, and even of Latin—though, of course, more than half of the whole number comes from non-British writers. It was thought at least possible that young British lawyers should go to be trained at Augustodunum (Autun), a great school in Gaul. The Roman dress and Roman habits of the table established themselves on British soil; and a Greek "grammatikos," or lecturer on literature, might find it worth his while to travel even from Asia Minor to Britain. Another side of Roman life, too, made itself at home here—the bloody sports of the arena. One or two amphitheatres of a rough kind yet survive, as at Dorchester and Silchester; and the use to which they were put may be inferred from the vigorous group of gladiators depicted in mosaic-work on the Roman pavement which has been unearthed at Bignor, and from some designs on pottery.

Still, we must not exaggerate the extent of the Romanised area. There are few inscriptions from Devon and Cornwall, and very few from the greater part of Wales; and it is, therefore, not without significance that we find Celtic speech still surviving in Wales and not long dead in Cornwall. No Roman villas have been discovered north of Aldborough in Yorkshire. Britain produced no distinguished Latin author, no one to set off against an Ausonius from Gaul, a Quintilian or a Martial from Spain. It had no famous schools or great professors, such as the Gallic ones made known to us by the piety of Ausonius. The works of art from British soil which are stored in our museums are often, like many of the inscriptions, of singularly rough and, indeed, barbaric character. Hewn in coarse material, ill-proportioned, and clumsily wrought, they show what the art of Greece, transmitted by Roman teachers, might come to in a remote land. The tombstones and other such records mention comparatively

few but military and official people. Of the Greek civilisation, which had elevated and softened that of Rome and which went hand-in-hand with it in its conquests, Britain has but poor traces to show. Some Greek inscriptions there are, but they are few and uninteresting.

The fact is that there was a wide gulf between the polished gentleman of British descent, who had embraced the Roman life and learning, and his poor countrymen, unimproved and obstinate in adhesion to their own ways and their own religion. Some such contrast between classes as Russia can show now, Britain might show then. In spite of the fact that Martial could boast of his books finding readers in this island, and that Juvenal could jestingly talk of Thule (Shetland or Iceland?) engaging a teacher of rhetoric, the mass of the folk must have been plunged in the deepest ignorance. No wonder that Britain, like other Western provinces, was a favourite hunting-ground of eye-doctors and other quacks. No wonder that of the very few doctors' names which are come down to us as those of men practising in the island, half are good Roman names and the other half are Greek. Where science languished, magic thrived, and British magic was known even in Rome. Two curses written out on leaden plates, and probably left buried to work out their fulfilment, have been preserved into our time. According to one found at Bath, somebody has stolen the writer's napkin: "May he melt (or rot) for it!" From the other, discovered in Gloucestershire, it appears that Silvulanus has lost a ring. The gods shall have half the value if they will bring it to light. "May they refuse health to the thief!" Charms were in use too, either among the men of the garrison or among the Britons. There were signs by which the evil eye could be baffled. There were forms of words likely to bring good luck, and, therefore, engraved on objects of daily use, as *Vivas*—"Long life to you!" *Utere felix*—"Use me and prosper!"

A belief in magic has been found compatible with all forms of religion, but in Britain magical rites were very closely connected with the Druid system, Religion. which had been crushed in the island of Mona (Anglesey) by the two campaigns of 61 and 78. The curses which the Druids uttered "with hands raised to heaven," as they stood on the

shore of the sacred island, had for a moment frozen the blood of the soldiers and stayed their advance; and even after the hopeless defeat of these priests and of the excited women who stood by them, "dressed in black like furies, with loose hair and brandishing torches," the various forms of British religion by no means died out. The Roman government did not try to destroy the religion of any of its subjects. If they were orderly and law-abiding, they might worship what they pleased and as they pleased. They were encouraged to take part in emperor-worship, but no one save a madman tried to make that worship compulsory. If they would identify their gods with those of their conquerors, so much the better; but they could do as they liked. Tolerance bore its natural fruit: religious strife was unknown, and worshippers of a most motley host of deities have left us their names and those of their gods, chiefly engraved upon votive offerings. Who these worshippers were it is not always easy to say. Sometimes there is but the name of a good Italian deity, and we have no means of knowing whether the dedicator was a Romanised Briton or a soldier of the garrison. Thus Neptune and Hercules, Mars and Minerva, Jupiter Optimus Maximus and Apollo found worshippers here. The words *Fulgur divom* seem to mark, with old-fashioned Italian scrupulousness, the place which the wrath of Heaven had struck with lightning somewhere on the bleak line of the Northumberland Wall. Dedications to the *Genius loci*, which occur often, have a true Roman ring about them. But when Apollo's worshipper cannot spell Apollo's name, we begin to think he was not much of a Roman; and when Minerva is identified with *dea Sulis*, or *dea Sulis* with Minerva, we suspect that the dedicator was a provincial trying to stand well with both his own old god and the new one of his masters. "Mars Camulus," again, represents an attempt to unite a Roman deity with the British god after whom Colchester took its early name of Camulodunum. Sometimes a group of Oriental deities goes along with the name of Syrian votaries. Sometimes we can trace the gods to Gaul or Germany; they may then be deities whose worship was widely spread among the Celts on both sides of the sea, or they may have been brought in by foreign settlers or by foreign cohorts serving with the army of occupation. The *deae Matres* or *Matronae*, who appear on (foreign) carved stones as three seated figures,

holding what may be symbols of increase and fertility, are known in Roman Germany as well as in Britain. But then, again, we find swarms of barbarous god-names, to which we can assign no meaning and no home. The strange human figure with the legs and head of a cock, which appears in the mosaic pavement of the Roman villa at Brading, had perhaps a religious meaning now lost. A few of the deities are distinctly national or tribal, as *dea Brigantia*, the goddess of the "blue (painted) Brigantes" of Yorkshire. Here and there natural features or powers were worshipped. The dedication to the nymphs and fountains found near Chester reminds us that our holy wells are older than Christianity; so does the image of the goddess Coventina floating on a water-lily, found in a well near Newcastle; while the respect paid to the *dea Tertiana*, a personification of fever or ague, shows the natural tendency to worship what is dreaded and not understood.

In fact, the religious monuments of Roman Britain exhibit a compendium of the religious state of the world in those days—of its old cults still surviving, and of its new tendencies. The altars and the votive-tablets are probably the most numerous class of the inscribed stones, and they illustrate fully the diversity of belief and practice. The worship of emperors, dead or living, was a common rite in which all provinces might join, and Britain was probably not behind the rest, although we cannot point with confidence to any central altar at which all the tribes might meet for the purpose, as we can point to the altar of Rome and of Augustus at Lugdunum (Lyon), the religious centre of Roman Gaul. A pious regard for the emperors is illustrated by many inscriptions, beside that one about the *Sevir* at York which was noticed before (p. 15). Dedications are frequent to the deity of the emperor, *numen Imperatoris* or *Augusti*, or *numina Augustorum*. The worship of Asklepios or Æsculapius, so fashionable under the early Empire in lands further East, may possibly have been discouraged in Britain by the greatness of the goddess Sulis and her medical springs at Bath, but still traces of it are found. The more mystical religions which had crept into the Empire from the East are represented here too. A dedication to the god Æon, set up by some one with the name of Arimanius, perhaps a Persian, reminds us how far beliefs and

believers could travel in days of universal peace. Serapis, originally a god from the south coast of the Black Sea, illustrates the tendency of the enlightened later paganism to fuse its deities and seek for one godhead under various titles. He was identified with Egyptian and with Greek objects of worship; he became great and fashionable in Alexandria and in Rome; and he has left traces of his worship even in this remote island of the Northern sea. Mithras-worship, too—a dangerous rival at one time of Christianity—had travelled all the way from Persia to South Wales and to Northumberland. This god was generally identified with the Sun, and the curious symbolic representations of him in the act of sacrifice are well known from the collections at the Louvre and the British Museum. On the line of the “Picts’ Wall,” near Housesteads, was found a cave, chosen, as caves or pits usually were, for the celebration of his secret rites; and we can imagine the believer, ardent for the remission of his sins, descending into the pit to be washed clean by the blood of the victim—a sheep or a bull—slain above him on a platform of pierced planks.

It had been a very common feature of religious practice in Greece and in Rome for individuals to combine voluntarily into associations for the honour of the deity whom they preferred; and this way of organising religious service is represented in Britain by a *collegium Apollinis*, and by a guild of worshippers of Mercury, and one of votaries of Sulis.

A number of inscriptions in honour of “the old gods” (*Di veteres*) suggest to us the probability that many persons must, while they adopted a certain amount of Roman cultivation, have yet disapproved the religious innovations which they saw creep in. The name of “Druid” does not occur among the Romano-British inscriptions, but the Druidical system would not be easily forgotten (what religion is easily forgotten?), and loyalty and superstition would co-operate in keeping up a reverence for the old faith. Another kind of lingering regret breathes in the tomb-formulæ which the province took over from Roman usage—*Dis Manibus*, or the rarer *Memoriæ*. The affectionate words which the sorrow of father or child, of husband or of wife, carved below these standing expressions, remind us of the common people, and of the daily sorrows and joys of which sight is so often lost, when we study the external history and the administrative mechanism of a nation. The



Roman garrison and the Romanised provincials are brought very near to us when we read expressions of grief whose genuineness would suffer by translation\* :—

*Simpliciae Florentine anime innocentissime.* (From York.)

*Filia matri et fratri piissima.* (Found near Caerleon.)

*Filie dulcissime.* (Northumberland.)

*Fil(iae) Kar(issimæ).* (Bath.)

*Conju(gi) et filiae pientissi(mis).* (Old Penrith.)

*Conjugi sanctissimæ quæ vixit annis xxxiii sine ulla macula.* (Northumberland.)

*(Conjugi cum qua) vixi sin(e ulla querella).* (Somersetshire.)

It is generally in Britain a man's heirs who have buried him, not, as so often in Italy, a club (*collegium*) to which he belonged. This probably does not point to the strength of domestic affection, but is due to two facts. (1) The tombstones which we have are those of soldiers or of men of position, who would not have to rely on a burial club. (2) The poorer Britons cannot have been educated up to the point of peaceful co-operation at which burial clubs could be founded and regularly worked.

About Christianity in Roman Britain we must speak with caution, because so very little is known. While it is not true to say that we can find no traces of Christianity from Britain while it was under Roman dominion, we may safely affirm that the traces are of the very scantiest. The Christian inscriptions are few, and chiefly from sites not then of great importance. To adopt the careful summary of a modern inquirer: "Statements about British Christians at Rome or in Britain, or apostles or apostolic men preaching in Britain in the first century, rest on guess, mistake, or fable. . . . Evidence for the existence of a Christian Church in Britain during the second century is also unhistorical." But the names of some British bishops are known from the end of the third century or beginning of the fourth; and at the end of the fourth there was "a settled Church" in Britain with churches, altars, scriptures, discipline, holding the Catholic faith, and having intercourse with both Rome and Palestine.†

\* The spelling and other peculiarities of form are preserved as they stand on the originals.

† Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, 1, 22, 24, 7, 10.

PAGANISM, to use a later word, was the religion of the classical world during the heyday of its civilisation.

**R. WILLIAMS.**  
**Heathen Britain.**

Consequently there is a plentiful supply of materials, in writings, structures, etc., which render the depicting of the religious life, and the reconstruction of the religious creed, of the Greek and the Roman a comparatively easy undertaking. With the Celt it was otherwise: he abjured his paganism at a time when civilisation can scarcely be said to have dawned upon him. The picture of Celtic heathenism can, therefore, be drawn only in a faint and often uncertain outline. Such information as we do possess is derived from three sources:—(1) The writings of Greek and Roman authors, recording the writers' observations or the narratives of such as had travelled, commanded, or governed in countries inhabited by Celts. (2) Writings of Celts themselves, of a later and chiefly post-pagan date. (3) The results of modern anthropological and antiquarian researches.

At the time of Julius Cæsar's invasion (B.C. 55), the first dawn of history in Britain, it was peopled by the Iberians, the earliest known inhabitants, supposed to be non-Aryan, and two branches of the Celtic family—the Goidels and the Brythons. These two latter divided the island between them, somewhat as the Britons and the Saxon tribes did at a later period—the Goidels answering to the Britons, the Brythons to the Saxons. All that remained of the Iberians were traces, more distinct in the northern parts, among the Goidels.

These three different peoples, though alike much given to religion, as Cæsar relates, yet differed in their religion as in their civilisation. Civilisation travelled westwards, and carried with it religious as well as social and political innovations; so that what were at one time the religious practices of the Brythons of the eastern districts, became, at a later period, those of the Goidels of the west. And with the advent of the Romans, considerable modification of the old Celtic religion took place in the direction of the conquerors' faith.

Cæsar identifies the chief Celtic deities with the well-known gods of the Roman pantheon—  
**The Gods.** Mercury, Apollo, Mars, Jupiter, and Minerva.

The basis of this identification was, we cannot doubt, identity



of attributes and powers ascribed to the various deities by Celt and Roman. In the main, therefore, the leading ideas of the heathen Celt were those of heathen nations generally—the deification of Nature and the personification of its powers. “Such is to me,” says Carlyle, “the secret of all forms of paganism. Worship is transcendent wonder; wonder for which there is now no limit or measure; that is worship. To these primæval men, all things and everything they saw exist beside them were an emblem of the godlike, of some god.”

Of these deities, Mercury, probably known in Britain as Ofydd (Ovyth), was considered the chief. He was the inventor of all the arts, the patron of all roads and journeys, and his was the most potent influence in the acquiring of money and in commercial transactions. Of him, Cæsar states, there were very many representations, and of these Lucan has left us an interesting description. The god was represented as an extremely old man, with bald forehead, the remaining hair quite grey, the skin wrinkled by years and embrowned as that of men who have grown old in seafaring life. His clothing was a lion’s skin. In his right hand he held a club and in his left an outstretched bow, for which a supply of arrows was provided in the quiver which hung at his side. But Ofydd was also the god of speech. In the representation, he drew after him, by means of amber and gold cords fastened to their ears, a willing crowd of men. The other ends of the cords passed through the tip of the god’s tongue, who, so far from appearing to suffer in the ordeal, smiled benignantly upon his audience.

Of Apollo, Cæsar merely states that he was considered the repeller of diseases. Besides this, however, he was the Celtic sun-god. His British name was Mapon—later, Mabon—meaning “a boy, or male child.” He was generally represented accompanied by an elderly goddess known as Sirona, his mother, according to Welsh mythology, where Mapon figures as “Mabon mab Modron”—Mabon, son of Modron.

The god of war, Mars of classic mythology, was specially venerated among the Celts. Camulus, as he was most popularly known, in addition to presiding over and deciding the fortunes of war, also ruled the winds. At an early period he seems to have occupied the position of the state god

*par excellence*. Upon the outbreak of war a public vow was made that all the spoil taken from the enemy should be devoted to the war-god. And when the war was ended, and victory assured, the captured animals were sacrificed, and the other booty heaped up in the sacred spots of the cities. Any violation of this vow, either by withholding, like Achan, or subsequently purloining the booty, was regarded as the highest form of treason, and treated accordingly.

Jupiter was known under various names, according to the functions and powers attributed to him. As Sucelo or Tarannus, he wielded the thunderbolt. As Esus or Hesus, he was the lord of woodlands, fields, and gardens, and the patron of the shepherds. Under the name Nodens—Welsh, Nudd or Lludd (Lud)—he answered to the Roman Neptune, the ruler of the sea. Under this character he had a temple at Lydney, on the Severn, where a picture of him has been discovered. He is shown as a youthful deity, crowned with rays, standing in a chariot drawn by four horses, and accompanied by winged figures representing the winds.

The only goddess mentioned by Cæsar is Minerva. She was not, however, by any means the only female deity, most of the gods having goddesses associated with them. The goddess whom Cæsar identified with Minerva, and to whom the initiation of the various arts and trades was ascribed, was Brigantia, the Irish Bridget, known in later Welsh mythology as Keridwen.

There remains Dis Pater, or Cernunnos, as the Celts called him. He was the Celtic Pluto and Janus in one. To him the Celts traced their descent, and in honour of him, in all probability, it was that they started all their computations of time with the night.

In addition to these, there was a multitude of inferior deities, fairies, genii, and demons—remains, **Fairies and Demons.** probably, of the element-worship supposed to have prevailed among the Iberians, and flourishing principally among the Goidels of the Western districts. First among these came the Genius Loci. Every neighbourhood had its special protecting genius, whose festival was annually celebrated with offerings and libations. Next came the mother goddesses, called in Latin inscriptions *Matres* or *Matronæ*. These were sometimes benignant fairies,

sometimes malevolent ogresses. There was also a host of divinities, friendly and unfriendly to man, with whom the salient features of the landscape were peopled. Each forest, every mountain peak, rock, lake, river, and spring had its divinity. The name *Dee*, so common for British rivers, is a survival of these times. The North Wales *Dee* enjoyed special renown as the *Aerven*, or genius of war. Even as late as the twelfth century its banks were carefully and eagerly scanned upon the outbreak of war between the English and the Welsh. The eating away by the river of its English or Welsh bank foretold disaster to the corresponding army in the pending struggle. Like the Greeks, the Welsh also personified diseases. The yellow death was "*Y Fad Felen*," while to this day the ague is known in some parts of Wales as "*Yr hen wrach*," the old hag. Closely allied to this was the belief in witches and witchcraft which prevailed. A statue dedicated to "*The Three Witches*" was recently discovered at Hexham. This, like many of the other beliefs of these early times, long baffled all the efforts of Christianity and enlightenment to banish it. Within living memory in North Wales a bedridden young poet's long-continued infirmity was implicitly believed to be the result of his having been "*offered to the sea*" by an old hag animated by family spite.\*

The Druidical system, also supposed to be a modified form of the Iberian religion, prevailed among the Goidels. Its most remarkable feature was the powerful hierarchy by which it was ministered—the Druids, so called from "*dru*," the Gaulish for oak. They were exempted from payment of the tribal taxes, and the obligations of military service. So great was their influence, that when two armies were on the point of joining battle, the Druids, rushing in between, could forbid the combat. And the excommunication of Hildebrand was not more feared nor followed by stricter ostracism than that of the Druids. From these high privileges many either voluntarily entered their order (the Druids were not a caste), or were brought up for, and placed in, it by parents or friends.

The whole order was presided over by an Archdruid,

\* Since the above was written, the writer has been astonished to find, in Central Wales, a district where witchcraft is still implicitly believed in, and believed to be practised.

elected for life from among the senior Druids. If there was one whose merits rendered him pre-eminent, he succeeded without dispute. If several eligible candidates entered the field, the chief was chosen by the vote of the order—not always, however, without an appeal to arms.

Besides the chief, or Archdruid, the order comprised three grades—Druids proper, Bards, and Ovates. The respective status and the distinctive functions of each grade are difficult to ascertain. But thus much is generally agreed upon—that the Druids were the philosophers and the masters of religious ceremonies, presiding at, while others performed, the sacrifices; the Bards were poets and singers, setting forth the praises of their benefactors, invoking confusion for their enemies, and recording the prowess and excellencies of the departed, in verses, which they accompanied on the harp; the Ovates, as their title signifies, were augurs and diviners—the Roman Vates—and possibly chroniclers. An order of Druidesses is also supposed to have existed. When Suetonius Paulinus pursued the Druids into Anglesey, A.D. 56, on his landing, women in mourning robes, with flowing tresses and flaming torches, were seen rushing among the British warriors, inciting them to valour in defence of the last stronghold of their order.

The Druids in general were priests, judges—both criminal and civil—medicine-men, magicians, and the instructors of youths. So famous were the British Druids in this latter capacity, that in Cæsar's time Gaulish youths often resorted to them to complete their education. No sacrifice, either private or public, could be offered without the sanction and the presence of a Druid. These sacrifices, more especially in times of war or pestilence, often consisted of human victims. He

**Sacred Rites.** who could not procure such a victim vowed to immolate himself. For the public and state sacrifices each tribe had its settled sacrificial code. The immortal gods, if greatly incensed, could only be propitiated with human blood—that of condemned criminals being specially acceptable. On more than usually solemn occasions huge images of wicker-work were constructed, filled with these unhappy victims, and set ablaze. The event of a war, or other important future matter, was also not unfrequently sought by means of a human victim. He was struck

with a sword upon his loins, and the future divined from his contortions or sought in his entrails.

The great veneration of the mistletoe was a curious feature in the Druids' system. Its discovery on an oak was the occasion of a general festival. The presiding Druid, clothed in long, flowing robes of white, ascended the tree, and with a golden sickle cut the precious plant, which was received below into a white linen cloth held between two Druids, and a thankoffering of two white bulls was sacrificed.

Another equally curious superstition was the myth of the snakes' egg. A multitude of snakes, it was asserted, came together in summer, and, by blowing into the air a kind of foam, artificially formed an egg. The Druids pretended that they were able to divine the exact time when this took place, and that they caught the descending egg in a linen sheet. This, however, was a perilous undertaking, as the snakes fiercely pursued the thief till a river was placed between them. When possessed, the egg was supposed to ensure success in legal matters and access to the presence of kings. The Emperor Claudius put a Roman knight to death for wearing it in his bosom while prosecuting a legal action. And Pliny relates that he had himself seen one of these eggs, of the size of an ordinary apple. The truth respecting it seems to have been that the egg was made of glass and used by the Druids to further their impostures.

The doctrinal system of the Druids is all the more difficult to ascertain inasmuch as all their teaching was oral—partly the better to preserve its secrets, partly for the culture and preservation of the memory. The teaching, so far as it is known, comprised the knowledge of the immortal gods—chiefly, it is inferred from their open-air worship, of Jupiter; the immortality of the human soul, and the Pythagorean doctrine of its transmigration; the movements of the stars, and the extent of the earth. This teaching lasted sometimes for twenty years, and usually consisted in committing to memory oracular sayings generally expressed in triplets (triads) and often in verse, a mode of imparting knowledge which lasted among the Welsh down to a comparatively late period.

The power of the Druids was irretrievably broken by the invasion of Anglesey, the slaughter of the order, and the felling of the groves. When <sup>Celtic Christianity.</sup>

we next meet them in Irish and Scotch history they are little more than the counterparts of Elymas the Sorcerer, pretenders to magical powers, hanging about the courts of the tribal chieftains. Celtic heathenism became, especially in the towns, more and more assimilated to the eclectic paganism, the then fashionable religion of Rome, till at length both disappeared before the advance of Christianity.

Who the first apostle of Britain was cannot now be determined. St. Clement's words, that St. Paul travelled "to the extremities of the West," led some to assert that he was the great apostle of the Gentiles himself. Another tradition attributed the work to Bran, the father of Caractacus, the brave Silurian leader who, for nine years successfully resisted the valour and discipline of the Roman armies. Bran, detained in Rome as a hostage for his son, was converted by St. Paul, a contemporary prisoner, and ultimately returned to carry the good news to his countrymen. While a third, and the most renowned legend, claims St. Joseph of Arimathea as the founder of the British Church. According to this legend, St. Joseph, Lazarus, and his two sisters, having been exposed by their persecutors in an open boat, without either oar or sail, were providentially carried to Southern Gaul. Thence St. Joseph, always bearing with him the Holy Grail, with twelve companions started to convey the Word of Life to Britain. Landing in the Bristol Channel, they settled on the Isle of Glastonbury, where St. Joseph, constrained by the incredulity of his hearers to perform a miracle, planted his staff in the earth, commanding it to put forth leaves and blossom. This led to the conversion of the king—St. Joseph's staff becoming the famous Glastonbury thorn which ever after bloomed on Christmas morning, the anniversary of the miraculous event.

These, and other stories, do not possess the historical authority, antiquity, or consistency sufficient to raise them from the domain of legend into that of even probable history. Like many another good man's name, that of the first apostle of Britain is lost in the mist and haze of the past. The probability is that Christianity reached this country as it reached others—through a variety of agencies. Individual Christian believers among the soldiers and civil officers, who were continually

**Conversion of  
Britain.**

**Probable Agencies.**



passing and repassing between Rome and Britain, in all likelihood made the first converts, while missionaries from the Greek missions at Lyons and Vienne, in Gaul, founded before A.D. 150, organised these scattered converts into a Church. The earliest historical evidences on the subject confirm and seem to mark the successive steps in this theory. The existence of Christians in Britain is first mentioned by Tertullian about A.D. 208. In A.D. 304, during the Diocletian persecution, St. Alban was martyred at Verulam, since called St. Albans. Christianity had then attained a position deserving the notice of the civil powers. In A.D. 314 the presence of the British Bishops of York, London, and (probably) Caerleon on Usk, at the Council of Arles in France, proves the existence of an organised Church in the southern half of the island.

It must not, however, be supposed that the whole, or the mass, of the nation had yet been converted. Though, thanks to their religious disposition and their quick, sympathetic temperament, the Britons were in a marked degree predisposed to welcome the call of Christianity, yet it was not till centuries later that the Church had penetrated among the mountains and glens of even Southern Britain. Churches in Wales were originally dedicated to their founders. At the beginning of the eighth century this practice was superseded in favour of dedication to St. Michael. Now the churches dedicated to St. Michael—Llanfihangel—are, with scarcely a single exception, situated in wild mountain glens or marshy fastnesses. These mark the last retreats of dying paganism, and were evidently not occupied by the Church until about the beginning of the eighth century.

Christendom was as yet undivided, and the leading features of the universal Church, episcopal orders, the Catholic faith, and a sacramental liturgy, appear from the first in the British branch. The existence of the threefold ministry—bishops, priests, and deacons—is shown by the presence of British representatives of each order at the Council of Arles. From the beginning the episcopate was diocesan or territorial, but possessed some features peculiar to itself. One of these was the absence of an archbishop. Though personal eminence secured a primacy of honour for bishops of different sees at different times, no archbishop, in the common acceptation of the title, existed in Wales even down to the

**Characteristics :  
Bishoprics.**

union of the Church in Wales with the Church in England in the twelfth century. Another peculiarity was the absence of any obligation of celibacy—a condition of things which lasted in the Welsh Church down at least to the eleventh century. A son frequently succeeded his father in the episcopate, as was the case with Sulien and Rhyddmarch of St. David's, in 1088, two names unsurpassed in Welsh history for piety and learning. There were also peculiarities of ritual in the consecration of bishops. Consecration might be performed by one bishop instead of three, which was elsewhere the rule, and was attended with some ceremonies, such as anointing the hands and head of the consecrated, not in vogue in other Churches. But what more than anything else distinguished the British episcopate was the noble origin of its members. The bishops were either princes or members of princely houses. St. David, the founder of the diocese called after his name, was a Prince of Ceredigion. Saints Teilo, Deiniol, and Cyndeyrn, the founders of the other Welsh dioceses, were also scions of the noblest families.

Members of the princely houses were also the leaders in what constituted the special glory of the British or Welsh Church, viz., its numerous monastic establishments, or "coreu" (sing., *côr*), as they were termed. The chieftain often became the abbot, and the clan the members of his *côr*. The country was covered with a network of these houses. The smallest had a roll of fifty inmates. The largest, such as the famous colleges—for they were educational as well as religious institutions—of Bangor-is-Coed in Denbighshire, and St. Illtyd's College at Llantwit Major, reckoned their members by thousands. The time was apportioned between worship, study, and hard manual labour, the latter being a distinguishing feature of Welsh monasticism. But the great purpose of these settlements was missionary. The Celtic monastery had an entirely different rationale from that of the later English and Continental monastery. The latter was the refuge of them that fled from the evils of the world. The former was the training-home of those who sallied forth to battle with those evils. Each house was the centre of missionary efforts. The daily round was varied with evangelising journeys into neighbouring districts. Stone crosses were set up to mark the preaching stations; and, in course of time, converts were



made and a rude building, answering in purpose to the corrugated-iron mission room of the present, was constructed. Ultimately a suitable church was erected, an endowment and a burial-ground provided, and the whole consecrated by the fasting and prayers of the mission-priest and then called after his name. Thirty-one parishes in Carnarvonshire alone still bear the names and testify to the missionary labours of the original founders of their churches, such as St. Tudno, St. Peris, and St. Cybi, in Llandudno, Llanberis and Llangybi. Often the name of the church does not appear in the parish name. St. Beuno, having obtained from Cadwallon the township of Clynog, in Carnarvonshire, settled there with his cōr. The conversion of the neighbourhood, and the erection of a church dedicated to the saint, quickly followed. The surrounding districts were next invaded, and, in addition to those dedicated to members of his college, no less than seven parish churches dedicated to St. Beuno himself testify to his missionary activity.

During succeeding centuries waves of religious enthusiasm, or revival, still characteristic of Celtic religion, swept over these monastic colleges, always resulting in a fresh swarm of missionary offshoots, which issued in the successive conversion of Ireland, Scotland, and, thence, of the greater portion of Saxon England.

The earliest Creed was the Apostles'. In 325 A.D. the British bishops assured St. Athanasius, the great champion of the true faith in that age, of their acquiescence in the Creed of Doctrine  
and Worship. Nicæa, put forth seven years before, and of their adherence to the Catholic faith. These, with the later so-called Athanasian Creed, completed the triad of formularies which continue to this day the standard expression of the faith in the Anglican Church. But this adherence to orthodoxy was not by any means a matter of course. With his religious propensities the Celt has a distinct turn for metaphysics. Controversial questions of this nature produced violent disputes. When Morgan the Briton, better known as Pelagius, about the year 400 A.D. promulgated his heretical notions respecting original sin and man's natural powers of spiritual recovery, in no part of Christendom did the controversy rage more fiercely than among the hæresiarch's

compatriots. The tribal character of British monasticism tempted the monks to interfere in intestine strifes. During religious controversies the civil and ecclesiastical issues were often intermixed, and the inter-tribal struggles assumed the aspects of religious wars. Thus it happened during the Pelagian controversy, till, at last, the British bishops in despair appealed to their kinsmen in Brittany for assistance in combating the error; and two Breton bishops, Saints Germanus, or Garmon, and Lupus, or Bleiddyn, were deputed to come over for the purpose.

Of the Liturgy in use in the British Church prior to this visit of St. Garmon, A.D. 429, little is known. It was probably the old Gallican modification of the Ephesine Order, originally brought by the founders of the Gallic missions from Ephesus. During St. Garmon's sojourn the Liturgy was again brought into conformity with the later Gallican use. The services consisted, besides the occasional services, such as baptism, burial, etc., of the offices for the hours and the Liturgy proper, or the service of the Holy Communion. The latter consisted of two portions—the service of the catechumen, for those under instruction preparatory to baptism, and the service of the faithful, from which the catechumen was excluded. The services for the hours consisted of hymns, psalms, collects, and lessons from Holy Scripture. Of this latter, the British Church possessed a version peculiar to itself, differing from both the *Vetus Latin* and the *Vulgate*.

The method adopted in the instruction of the laity resembled, and was probably borrowed from, that of the Druids. Moral, spiritual, and scriptural truths were expressed in the form of poetical aphorisms. "The best of occupation, work"; "The best of sorrows, sorrow for sin"; "The best of attitudes, humility," are among the recorded sayings of the prince-abbot St. Cadoc of Llancarvan. Sunday was strictly observed in the monasteries, but it was long before cessation from work became total and general. The ecclesiastical season of Lent and the great festivals were also duly celebrated. The time for celebrating Easter was one of the subjects of dispute between St. Augustine and the British bishops, on the arrival of the former to evangelise the Saxons. Single immersion in Holy Baptism and the shaving of the front

portion of the hair, "from ear to ear," constituted the other differences when the British Church, after its isolation consequent upon the Saxon conquest, again came into contact with Christian Europe. With Rome the relation of the Celtic Church was what might be expected under the circumstances of the time. To the Briton Rome represented the heart and centre of the world, the home of civilisation and the source of all learning. The bishop of such a city was naturally honoured and respected. But, as was afterwards shown, this was not meant to imply any supremacy or authority, which, when claimed centuries later, was promptly repudiated.

Until persecution had ceased at the Edict of Milan, A.D. 313, but few ecclesiastical buildings could have existed. The structures afterwards erected partook of the character of the surrounding buildings. Town and country churches differed then as now. In the towns, where the Romans had reared, or taught the natives to rear, stone buildings, such edifices were constructed for ecclesiastical purposes. Remains of some, even of Roman date, are still existing, such as Reculver, Lyminge, and St. Martin's, Canterbury. In the country, on the contrary, where the inhabitants still dwelt in rude structures of wood logs or wattle, the churches were of similar construction. The erection of a stone church, in 401 A.D., by St. Ninian at Candida Casa is recorded as a "practice uncommon among the Britons." The model upon which these early churches were built was the Roman Basilica; and they generally consisted of a nave and chancel—in the cases of stone buildings, also of side aisles. Inside the chancel, which had a raised floor, were placed an altar, usually of stone, a wooden pulpit, and seats for the clergy.

Endowments have already been mentioned. Gildas, writing 550 A.D., states that the "parochiæ" of Wales were formed and endowed in his time. These parochiæ were not, at least in most cases, the modern parishes, but the spheres of labour assigned to, or undertaken by, the monastic centres. The duty of almsgiving was taught as one of the special obligations of the Christian life; and the Scriptural, and indeed heathen, precedent of giving a tenth, generally recommended. Testamentary

Buildings.

Endowments.

bequests to the Church, recognised in the earliest known code of Welsh laws, were also sources of endowments; while the privileges attaching to a consecrated church rendered "arglwydd" and "taeog" equally ready to further its erection and endowment. The existence of a church on his estate doubled the "arglwydd's" (lord's) rent. The consecration of a church in a township of "taeogiaid," or serfs, enfranchised the inhabitants.

This last provision is an instance of the many ways in which the Church of that day sought to mitigate the condition of the miserable and to succour the oppressed. It is not easy to overrate the value, in an age of brutal violence, of a system which cowed unrestrained physical force with moral power. The power and influence of the clergy were great, and were unsparingly exercised on behalf of the unprotected. The dying lord was exhorted to will the freedom of his slaves. The weak and the pure were fearlessly defended from violence and lust. The churches and their precincts were sacred, and afforded a refuge which even kings durst not violate. This led to the entrusting of charters to the care of the monastic colleges. "Breiniau Arfon," the privileges of Arvon, were consigned to the custody of the coreu of Clynog and Bangor. Even the brute creation were safe. King Meirchion dared not drag the hunted stag from the feet of St. Illtyd, where it had sought safety.

THE earliest rude implements of the primitive races in Britain are found either in patches of river-gravels, on the banks of rivers, or in caves and rock-shelters near water. The former may be looked on as representing mere halting-places on the line of march, the *débris* of feasts such as the "kitchen-middens" of Denmark probably were, or fishing stations; the latter may indicate more prolonged occupation as dwellings.

The implements in both cases are of the simplest character; but, naturally, a greater variety of chipped stones are found in the second group. The river-gravels contain rough flakes of flint that might be used as skin-scrapers or lance-heads, together with ovate or pointed stone axes, which may have been either mere

C. COOPER KING.  
Warfare.

Palæolithic  
Weapons.

hand-weapons or may have been hafted, there is no evidence to show which. The caves contain similar relics, together with occasionally better flakes, bearing traces of use as scrapers of bone-implements or lance-shafts, rude "strike-a-lights," apparently, from the nature and direction of the minor chippings, and roughly-fashioned masses that may have been either hammerstones or missiles.

As with savage races now, there was in these early days probably no real distinction between tools, domestic implements, and weapons. What would split a marrow-bone would cleave an enemy's skull as well; the flake represented the knife, used for all purposes for which such an implement would prove useful.

The weapons of these earliest inhabitants of Britain were intended for close fighting evidently, as their axes show. Of useful spear-heads or arrow-heads as missile weapons there are none that seem worth the using, according to our modern ideas. "In so hard a life only the fittest survived, and possibly Palæolithic man's mistrust of living things extended to his brother man, as well as to the fierce beasts of the chase. His habits may well have been those of a family gathering (and even that isolated) rather than those of a community. The community is only possible with mutual trust, and that implies a higher form of life than his. But little removed from the beast he slew for food, he was a savage though a man."

He had no military organisation, in all probability, higher than that of the "household." Like later nomads of a higher class, sons helped fathers in defence; and the possession of stalwart lads was a blessing which enabled the fortunate possessor to fearlessly "speak with his enemy in the gate."

**Palæolithic  
Warfare.**

Long after Palæolithic man had passed away, the race arrived with which history can be said in some sense to begin. By the anthropologist they are classed as Neolithic; ethnologically they may be called Iberian, and their blood possibly runs to-day in the Basques, and even, to a limited degree, among the populations of the extreme west of our islands, such as those of South Wales and Cornwall.

These so-called Iberians, or Neolithic men, introduce us to a higher form of life, though they are still far from being highly civilised. Apparently

**Iberian Weapons.**

their domestic morals were not highly developed; their power of erecting great works of stone or earth was still limited. Higher civilisation than theirs depends on the means of carrying out artistic or massive designs, and that the long-skulled or dolichocephalic Iberians in their early days could scarcely hope to do. They had not, practically and physically, the power of developing them. Barrows that contain undoubted remains of them abound mainly in tools of stone. Delicately chipped and fashioned as they are, polished and beautifully formed, they still could not with these leave such lasting traces of their lives as were left by those who followed them. The age was still one of stone.

None the less, their implements are divisible into those for peace and war. There are arrow-heads, and lance-heads, axes, and what seem to be either throw-stones or sling-stones. Some of the so-called "celts" are gouge-like in form, and were destined for deft work. Spindle-whorls and net-sinkers belong probably as much to this age as to that in which bronze flourished.

Yet clearing the land of wood and copse must have been so slow a process as to be much neglected.

**Military Organisation.** Cæsar's account of Britain gives the impression that the tribes even of his day were either nomads with flocks and herds, or hunters. They were not a settled people yet, and their military organisation—possibly still only that of the family, or, at the best, the group of wandering families—was purely temporary for the purposes of blood-feud, or raids for plunder. The sparse population was not settled enough for purposes of tribal war on a definite scale.

It may well be argued, therefore, that such people were little likely to erect protective earthworks

**Strongholds.** except for two specific purposes—the one the "cattle pound," the other the "place of refuge." Towns—"oppida"—real centres of life, business, and defence, can never exist with unsettled peoples. The stationary

**Wandering Tribes.** village community only comes into being with agriculture and trade. Only such associations lead to further clearance of the land and improvement of the communications between settled centres, however poor, which, as the years go on, become roads. Nomads and a limited population

have neither the time, nor the strength numerically, to create highways; they must rest satisfied with such tracks as their feet wear on the highest, because the driest, land, beyond the marsh and flood of ill-drained river valleys.

These early trackways are always traceable from ford to ford, winding along the ridges that bound the former bog, and marked frequently, near the water **Communications.** areas themselves, by the flint flakes and rough, half-chipped flints where the nomad halted for his daily meal by the side of the water he could not carry. Here he pointed and re-furbished his weapons, for war or for the chase, much as a modern Yankee or an English schoolboy whittles a stick or fashions his childish lance. When he failed to produce any useful result, or when the tools were worn out, he left them there, as we find them now, with the cores whence he struck the flakes for arrow-heads. The refuse flakes themselves, and the "briquets," or "strike-a-lights," he used for fire-raising.

Here and there only do these trackways lead to the faint traces on the dry hillside where his poor pit-dwellings, or kraals, stood. Near them, in some cases, are the low outlines of the earthen enclosure which, only some two or three feet high now, enclose an area where his cattle sheltered at night from wolf or other wild beast, and which in his time was possibly surmounted by, and formed the base of, the hedge of stakes and wattle that fenced his living possessions in. Their present magnitude, their limited area, their being commanded by heights within range, whence missiles could be thrown, preclude the idea that they ever were defensive against a resolute armed foe. Such an instance is well shown at Knook Castle, near Heytesbury.\* It is but 180 yards long by 100 yards wide, and is seen into from the neighbouring hill-land; and near it are the traces of old division lines and circular marks, rich with black earth and fragments of rude tools and ruder pottery, where, when he halted, he enjoyed such domestic life as he could get.

It does not follow that it was only occupied thus early, for it lived far on to Roman times, as other remains show; but it is typical of the weak entrenchments that a people provided with simple tools only—such as pointed sticks or deer's horns,

\* Colt Hoare's "Wiltshire," vol. i., p. 87.



whereby to loosen the earth ; flat stones, split wood, or the bladebones of animals, to lift it with ; wicker baskets, or even the skins of beasts, to transport it to its proper place—could alone be expected to make.

The collection of huts in these early times which we dignify by the name of village, was not itself fortified. It was not large enough, nor was it worth the trouble.

Defensive measures for the protection of the nomad families or septs were taken elsewhere. If each small clan was too weak in itself to offer serious resistance to an invading raid, the whole number of such, within a certain radius, may have, combined, been able to hold their own. For such purposes a central defensive portion—a ground selected for its defensive value—concealed, may be, in ground difficult of access, or which, from its command, possessed value because of the extended view it afforded, may well have been chosen as the place of refuge of the flying families with their herds, their women and children, and their few poor valuables. The British town, even according to the Latin writers, was an enclosure in a “thick wood, with ditch and rampart.”

It is difficult to account otherwise for the construction of “camps” of weak trace, large area, and on ground that is simply commanding, unless it were such as to effect the purpose of a Ramoth or a Shechem. Such form no part of any general system of defence of a district. They are quite isolated, as the “Cæsar’s Camps” at Aldershot and Easthampstead Plain ; or as Ogbury, in Wiltshire, north of old Sarum, and Yarnbury, near Lavington, are.

Their very extent points to great capacity to hold beasts and non-combatants, with a very strong force of fighting men to keep their earthen parapets ; yet withal there is rarely within them—and those of quite a simple trace, without complex ramparts, are referred to—any traces of such permanent occupation as the near neighbourhood of “Knook Castle” shows. Moreover, on such high land the water supply is scanty. Wells are rare ; and, if they had been made, it is unlikely all relics of them would have disappeared. There are dew-ponds, it is true, but only in the open chalk downs, not on the breezy, fir-clad heaths of the “Bagshot sand” district, where such isolated works occur as much as they do on less pervious strata.



Great works, with great interior extent and an insufficient water supply, are neither towns nor places of permanent occupation by the large numbers that could alone defend them. If simple, they are the centres of local defence of people who could do no better, and who had not yet learnt that the permanent union of families in large bodies meant strength physically and numerically, as well as morally.

Thus round isolated Ogbury, which follows simply the shape of the hill top and has its entrance near the

Hill Forts.

river, are many places with ancient names on sites which Celtic groups may have first selected to be occupied in succession by all those who in turn seized upon the land. There are Wilsford (*wil*, a willow), Durnford (*deor*, a wild animal), Netton (*net*, cattle), Sallerton (*salh*, a willow), and Upper, Middle, and Lower Woodford.

Again, near Yarnbury (which may take its name from *yarn* or *garn*, a heap of stones; and *beorg*, a hill) are Orcheston (*orceard*, a garden), Shrewton (*scearn*, a division or district), Maddenton (*mai-dun*, the great hill), Codford (*coed*, a wood), Chittern (*chetel*, a name), Berwick (*ber*, a hedge; *wick*, a village), Winterbourne (*venta*, winter), and Elston (*Ella's town*). In the last four cases the modern villages, situated at the foot of the hill, have traces of the ancient villages on the adjacent spurs. The hill fort lies in an angle between two streams, over which the points of passage are marked by ancient names.

Both of these hill castles, then, may have been the local centres to which the people fled when some neighbouring marauder made a hostile raid. Such raids must have been short in duration, for the enemy could carry few supplies, and when the country had been ravaged and its spoil taken, the victorious invaders retreated whence they came. That spoil was poor enough, doubtless. But polished-stone implements meant the employment of slave or women's labour. Either would be gained by such a raid, and as the Zulu Impis overran their less powerful neighbours to "wash their assegais," and indulge their lust for conquest, so the British chieftain may have led the turbulent spirits of his tribe to glory and to plunder.

Then it was that the hill fortress had its work to do. The chord of human sympathy that lies within us all must throb a little at picturing that crowd of weeping women and anxious men assembled behind the earthen walls of Ogbury, while far

around the light of burning fires told the story of ruined homes. Many of these camps were altered and improved by conquering invaders, especially those of real strategical importance, whether by Gaulish invaders before the Roman time, by the Romans themselves, or by Saxon and Dane afterwards, would always be difficult of proof. But it seems certain that massive hill fortresses were later than simple forms like Ogbury. This, from its character, its workmanship, and its stone relics, may fairly be called British, if not pre-Celtic.

Examining any one in detail, we find that it is frequently situated on a prominent space, in which case the rampart is only lofty across the level neck joining the projection to the main hill mass ; or on an isolated hill, in which case it is fairly even all round, and not now lofty. Doubtless it was formerly higher, though probably not much higher than a man's breast, as is the case with a modern field parapet in fortification ; and it may have been furnished on top, as Viollet-le-Duc suggests, by a fence of stakes and wattle stout enough to stop a sling-stone or throw-stone, and prevent the entrance of a thrown lance or a shot arrow. Only on steep parts is it "scarpèd," and only at very weak points are there multiple ditches, for in such simple works as those referred to, complex ditches are most rare. The whole effort seems to have been to enclose a sufficient space with a single rampart, and increase the obstacle of approach by higher parapets, where necessary, to get command over an assailant, and by making steeper or more troublesome the approaches to other faces of the work. Better weapons of Neolithic type, and large, simple, outlined earth-works possibly mark the defences of the scattered Iberian tribes.

The long-skulled and probably pastoral population here described as Iberian were succeeded and conquered by a fair, round-skulled people variously classed as Belgæ (and therefore, perhaps, Germanic), Finns, and the Celtic vanguard. Here, for convenience, the latter view will be adopted. They were, at any rate, better armed and more highly skilled than those whom they vanquished. Art, and especially the art of war, based on the superior tools and weapons and therefore organisation, of the new-comer, naturally led to increased civilisation for the conquered, as missionary effort now follows the soldier's sword.

The only way of getting at what pre-historic people did is by discussing what work they could physically do. Great earthworks — “oppida” — such as Silchester, the Calleva of the Attrebates, or Maiden Castle, near Dorchester, imply superior organisation, warlike capacity for recognising the value of great defensive works, the power—possibly by slave labour after a successful campaign—of erecting monuments of the first class.

**Progress in  
Fortification.**

As occupation became more sedentary, the easier it was to make and hold great fortresses, for those who had to defend them lived there. By so doing there was greater clearance around, both for agricultural purposes and for protection. As arms improved, a “clear front of fire” was as valuable relatively then as it is all-important now.

Roads became better as they became more necessary for trade, or even for tribal concentration for defence. Earthworks were no longer isolated, they were grouped to defend these roadways, or to hold the tribal boundary against a possible adversary, as France has lined with fortresses the open frontier from Verdun to Besançon. “When we find entrenchments multiplied and distinguished by the vastness of their banks, the height of their keeps, and extreme depth of their ditches, we may suppose these to have been the work of people better versed in the art of castrametation.”\*

Thus arose great inter-tribal roads, the main lines of communication and a vast improvement beyond the poor tracks of an earlier time between one part of Britain and another.

**British Main Roads**

There are five of these known:—

1. The Watling Street, leading to Ireland, and starting from Richborough by London and Worcester to Festiniog. Thence it had two branches—the left to Carnarvon, the right by Chester, Manchester, and Corbridge to Cramond, Jedburgh, and the north.

2. The Ikenield Street, from the county of the Iceni (about the Wash and Yorkshire), by Newmarket and Dunstable to Streatley. Here it branched—the right by the Berkshire Ridgeway to Avebury; the left by Newbury

\* Colt Hoare's “Wiltshire,” vol. i., p. 17.

and Tangley to Old Sarum, Dorchester, Honiton, Exeter, Totnes, and the Land's End.\*

3. Akeman Street, from the eastern counties by Bedford, Buckingham, Alcester, Woodstock, Cirencester, Aust (where it crossed the Severn), Caerleon, Cardiff, Caermarthen, and St. David's.

4. Ryknield Street, from the Tyne by Bruchester, Boroughbridge, Aldborough, Ribston, Bolton, Chesterfield, Burton Wall, Birmingham, Tewkesbury, Gloucester, Chepstow, and so by Abergavenny and Caermarthen to St. David's.

5. Ermyn Street, from East Scotland by Berwick, Brampton, Corbridge, to Catarick, where it divided; the western branch along the Ryknield Way to Alborough, Houghton, Doncaster, Southwell, and Staveley, where it rejoined its own eastern branch which had proceeded from Catarick by Northallerton, Stamford Bridge, South Cave, Lincoln, Ancaster, and near Witham.

Thence the road ran to near Stamford, Chesterton, Royston, Ware Park, Enfield, and Wood Green, to London.

Here it again divided—the western branch passing by Dorking and Pullborough to Chichester; the easterly passing by Bromley, Tunbridge, Wadhurst, and Eastbourne to Pevensey.†

Two subordinate roads are also mentioned by Sir Richard Colt Hoare:—

6. The Fosse Way, from about Seaton by Ilchester, Bath, Cirencester, Northleach, Claychester, to Lincoln.

7. The Via Julia, from Bath, Bilton, Caerwent, Caerleon, Cowbridge, Neath, and Caermarthen to St. David's.

Still irregular and winding, still making for ford-ways and the high land—though not so high as heretofore, for the lower slopes of the hill-land were clearer—these roads are much more definite, because, being links between settled places, they are more used. Not that they are metalled or made; and frequently from this cause (more probably than from reasons of concealment, which seem futile) they are sunken as fosse-ways from the traffic of people and of pack animals. But if the map be

\* Stukeley.

† Only a few places on these roads are mentioned to give their general direction.

examined, it will be seen that these roads are guarded at important points, that now would be called strategic, by works which even a modern engineer would call important.

They are not the massive earthen walls of many acres in extent, which enclosed the "Gwahl Vawr" of the Attrebates, which the Romans, later, christened "Calleva," and the Saxons "Silchester." Such as these were the cities of late Celtic times, while the others, formidable earth-castles of smaller area, were the "forts d'arrêts" that guarded either the great roads—such as they were—or the boundaries of the Celtic tribes.

Of these latter "Wansdyke" is the most important. Throughout its trace from the Severn Sea to Marlborough, and thence, though now obliterated, to the Thames, east of Reading, this old Celtic frontier was strengthened by massive works. No Roman would have thought it worth his while or worth his time to make such complex ditches as many of these show, except as mere obstacles to an enemy's assault. Well-armed men did not want such complexity, and the Celts were probably, as a rule, only provided with fairly good weapons of bronze. But though the Romans may have occupied them, as they stood, later; and even with small works, weakly garrisoned, adopted the same defensive methods, these irregularly-traced works, following the hill-contour, are Celtic in their tribal origin and are not based on any tactical organisation of the defending bodies.

These strong works, with deep ditches and powerful ramparts, are superior to the earlier works because erected by men with better implements, but are not Roman, because they do not fit into their battle organisation.

Celtic Britain's fighting strength was an improvement on that of Iberian days because there was greater local concentration of fighting-men in the "oppida" and greater garrisons distributed in the defensive frontier fortresses. All this displays greater tactical and administrative skill, based on the towns and villages, which had become permanent centres of life. Better means of communication, better roads, and therefore more rapid carriage of men and things, indicate greater defensive power—because more concentrated power—than the earlier population had dreamed of.

Probably even now the fighting was local rather than general. Family feuds may have still existed; but they were giving place to tribal forays for the sake of slaves, plunder, or martial glory.

The bronze spear and axe had taken the place of stone weapons, as armour of skins, or what not, was supplying the want of that defensive equipment which the earlier population had lacked.\*

And while the tribes of Iberian origin still kept up friendly communications with their co-religionists, the Veneti and others in Western Gaul, the immigrants, on the other hand, received aid and reinforcements from their powerful tribesmen and brethren in what now is Belgium. Bronze weapons, powerful and multiplex earthworks, characterise this later population. But their military system was but an extension of the family gatherings for defence which the conquered race had organised, and which the conquerors developed into clan gatherings, powerful for offence too.

Yet they had a certain skill in war, though its method was that of the guerilla, whether of an  
**The Celts in Battle.** Afghan tribe or a New Zealand clan. Like their modern survivors in Britain, they for long "did not know they were beaten." They used "long and pointless" swords, and carried small bucklers also, both probably of bronze, or bronze-bedecked. They had in their scythe-axled chariots a force of mounted infantry that was not to be despised; for, if the curious chariot-charge failed, their occupant jumped to the ground to fight on foot, while his driver "took cover" and awaited his return. They used mounted men as well as cavalry, and seemed to have trained dogs to help them in their outpost work.† Above all, they feared not death, for "their dogmas taught that souls never perished, but passed, at death, into other bodies." Those who have faced an Afghan rush or a Soudan charge can best appreciate the fighting power of the coastal British who first came face to face, and sword to sword, with the military might of Rome.

\*The tribes generally carried buckler, poignard, and short lance, "at the lower end of which is a piece of brass in the form of an apple, with which it is their custom to frighten their enemies."—Xiphilinus. (Colt Hoare, i. 10.)

† Hozier, "Invasions of England," vol. i., p. 7.

And this, the leading military power, and at that time the leading colonising power of the world too, came as the next invading wave from the south.

**The Roman  
Conquest.**

Julius Cæsar had conquered Gaul, and in so doing had found that British fighting men had joined in the resistance of the Gallic tribes which he had beaten down. It was the old story re-told of the wolf and lamb in the fable. Britain had, for family and racial sympathies, aided the invader, and had disturbed the stream of Roman conquest.

So it was that, on the 20th September, 54 B.C., the great general decided on invading Britain. But the story of its conquest must be very briefly told. The first effort made from "Portus Itius"—Boulogne—was nearly a disaster, certainly a failure. But for the personal courage of the standard-bearer of the 10th Legion (there were only the 7th and 10th), it is an open question whether the troops would have got on shore at all. The expedition "from find to finish" had lasted just three weeks. Even the second attempt—in May, 53 B.C.—only reached the Chilterns, though this time Cæsar led five legions; but he based on Richborough, crossed the Thames at Cowey Stakes and defeated Cassivelaunus, Captain of the Trinobantes, at Verulamium (St. Albans), and, receiving hostages, made peace. But no Roman garrison was left in Britain, and for nearly one hundred years the country was left to independence and external peace.

**Julius Cæsar, 54 B.C.**

This was not broken until A.D. 43, when the Emperor Claudius sent Aulus Plautius and Vespasian to Britain with the 2nd, 9th, 14th, 12th, and possibly the 7th Legions. Cunobeline was defeated, and Camulodunum, now Colchester, was taken; and while Vespasian subdued, in thirty-two battles, the district south of the Thames as far as Cornwall, Plautius brought into subjection the district north of the river as far as Gloucestershire.

**Claudius, 43 A.D.**

**Vespasian,  
Plautius, Ostorius.**

Publius Ostorius Scapula waged war against the Iceni near the Wash, and then turned his victorious arms against Caractacus in Siluria. But his defeat, after a most stubborn resistance in his last stronghold, Caer-Caradoc, in Shropshire, did not cow the native tribes. Again



the Iceni rose, under Boadicea, to be again heavily defeated by Suetonius Paulinus. But exhaustion led to peace, and the appointment of a wise administrator, as well as a skilful general, in Agricola did much to consolidate the

**Agricola.** Roman power and civilise the conquered race.

There were still the turbulent tribes of the extreme north of the island to be dealt with; but Agricola, like a wise general, assured the peacefulness of the country in his rear before he moved against the northern Celts.

**The Earliest Roman Roads.** During his government, therefore, the great military roads which crossed Roman Britain were completed, though possibly some may have been traced before; but it required peace and time to complete them as they were when the Romans left, and this the turbulent past had not fully afforded—certainly not in that portion of the land north of the Thames. Agricola saw that the necessary security of his “base of operations” depended on the civilisation which his wise administration began and which the growing years completed. “He saw that this could only be effected by giving them a relish for the arts and a taste for elegant pleasures. To this he excited them by his conversation in private and by his public measures. He encouraged them to erect temples, forums, and houses. He caused the sons of the British chiefs to be instructed in the language and knowledge of their conquerors. Such measures produced rapid effects. The Britons soon began to adopt the Roman dress, and they changed the rude garb of their ancestors for the dignified toga. The manners of the Romans also gradually took root among them, and they gained a taste for erecting porticos and baths, and indulging in other luxuries.”

And while this was going on he advanced into Scotland, and, after a two years’ campaign, finally defeated—at least for a time—the northern tribes under Galgacus, on the Grampian slopes about Dealgin Ross.\*

Moreover, in order that he might further protect the steadily progressing civilisation of the south against savage raids, he built between the Tyne and Solway, and again

\* General Roy, “Military Antiquities of the Romans in Britain,” p. 83.



between the Forth and Clyde, a chain of forts, both eventually to be the bases of more extensive lines of defence. One of these more extensive lines was the Wall of Hadrian, "the Roman Wall" *par excellence*, <sup>The Northern Lines of Defence.</sup> since it is better known to us than any other Roman work of its kind; the other, the Wall of Antonine, repaired later by Severus, from the Forth to the Clyde.

Hadrian's Wall is described by Mommsen ["Roman Provinces," I., p. 186] as in strictness

"a military road protected on both sides by fortifications, leading from sea to sea for a length of about seventy miles, westward to the Solway Firth, and eastward to the mouth of the Tyne. The defence on the north is formed by a huge wall, originally at least sixteen feet high and eight feet thick, built on the two outer sides of square stones, filled up between with rubble and mortar, in front of which stretched a no less imposing fosse, nine feet in depth, and thirty-four feet or more in breadth at the top. Towards the south the road is protected by two parallel earthen ramparts, even now six to seven feet high, between which is drawn a fosse seven feet deep, with a margin raised to the south, so that the structure from rampart to rampart has a total breadth of twenty-four feet. Between the stone wall and the earthen ramparts on the road itself lie the camp-stations and watch-houses, viz., at the distance of about four miles from one another the cohort camps, constructed as forts, independently capable of defence, with gate openings towards all the four sides; between every two of these a smaller structure of a similar kind with sally-ports to the north and south; between every two of the latter four smaller watch-houses within call of each other."

The more northern line of defence, the Wall of Antonine, consisted, according to the same writer, of

"a considerable earthen wall, with fosse in front and road behind, and so was not adapted [like the Wall of Hadrian] for defence toward the south; moreover, it also included a number of smaller camps." \*

The country had been mapped out into five districts (p. 13), of which the names are preserved in the Imperii Notitia, but the situations are almost entirely conjectural. These were protected by works of varying size at important strategic points at first, but later, at points joining the centres of national and civilised life.

\* The work of Severus is, however, referred by some inquirers to the Wall of Hadrian. On the whole subject, see J. C. Bruce, "Handbook to the Roman Wall" (3rd Ed., 1885). Some of Mommsen's statements cited above, however, are, from a military point of view, in my opinion, absolutely untenable.—C. C. K.

There were five classes of roads. The *Via Militares*, or military roads, ran as nearly straight as possible, and were designed for military purposes. Rapid concentration of troops, or reinforcement of isolated garrisons in a disturbed country, was as necessary then as now. It was only by such means that skill and discipline could prevail against great masses of brave but savage foes. To them the quickest were the shortest roads. They were not made for trade, commerce, or civil convenience. They linked only strategic points fortified, which were in their turn to become, or to be replaced by, towns. They were made by drawing two parallel furrows, between which the ground, levelled and beaten hard, was the "Pavimentum"; on this were placed in succession the "Statumen," a concrete of mortar and gravel; the "Rudus" of small stones and lime; the "Nucleus," a mixture of lime, chalk, broken tiles, or earth, or of gravel, sand and lime with clay; and lastly, the "Summum Dorsum," or "Summa Crusta," composed of either flag-stones or a surface of gravel and lime.\*

The whole mass was called the "Agger." On them at other intervals than the towns or camps were the *Diversoria* and *Caupones*—inns or resting-places; and at regular intervals of a Roman mile (the *mille passus*, equal to 4,834·28 ft.) were the "Milliaria," or milestones.†

The other roads, often "Romanised" on existing winding native trackways rather than originally Roman, were the "Vicinales," or branch roads; "Viæ Privatæ," or private roads; "Agrariæ," or country roads; and "Devix," or by-roads.

Guarding these were "camps" or fortresses, which were also divided into three classes:—

**Camps.**

1. The *Castra Exploratoria*, mainly of a temporary character and of weak trace.

2. The *Castra Æstiva*, of a semi-permanent character, sometimes strengthened still more if held on into the winter, as *Castra Hiberna*.

3. The *Castra Stativa*, or permanent holdings, which either became towns or were replaced by them when the fortress was no longer wanted to overawe the land and its people.

\* Vitruvius.

† The inscription on one at Leicester is "Imp. Cæsar. Div. Traian. Parth. F. Div. Traian. Hadrian Aug. Pont. IV. Cæs III. A Rates II."

But whatever these were, they had a definite form, if originally constructed by Roman hands, unlike the irregular earthworks of the Celts they supplanted, or the circular works of the Saxons and Danes who followed them.

They were more or less rectangular. They were square or oblong because their form depended on the parade formation of the Roman army. The legion, or any of its component parts, was an organised, disciplined body that "fell in for duty" as systematically and regularly as an English battalion or brigade.

It was not unlike the latter, for it ranged under the Empire from 4,000 to 6,000 or more regular troops, to which might be added an equal number of auxiliaries.

The space naturally varied with the strength of the force encamped, but a full legion occupied an area of about 1,620 ft. by 2,320 ft., and was covered by a rampart 6 ft. high and 8 ft. thick, with a ditch in front 3 ft. deep and 5 ft. broad.\* The dimensions of the latter, of course, varied with the necessity of holding the work with a small garrison, when the parapet was heightened and the ditch made complex with obstacles.

A good example of this is shown in the fort at Ardoch, in Strathallan, on the line of Agricola's conquest. Its regularity of form marks it Roman; in it was found an inscribed stone, showing it was once garrisoned by the first cohort of the Spanish auxiliaries; its compound ditches indicate a small garrison which had enlisted all the elements of defence that a successive series of obstacles against a savage rush could give. Only the inner rampart could have been seriously guarded. On each side was a gateway; in front the "prætorium" or "quæstorium," in rear the "decuman" or extraordinary, and on either side the "left and right principal" gates. In those ascribed to Agricola, these entrances are protected by bending out and overlapping the parapets where the gate was cut.

In England and Wales true Roman camps are rare, unless they be such as were afterwards converted into towns, such as Wareham, Colchester, Winchester, etc. In other instances they may have improved an existing fortress, as possibly, Vespasian did the British camp at Amesbury, which bears his name. If not quite regular, it is more so than a Celtic fort.

\* Godwin, "English Archæological Handbook," p. 22.

Or, as in the somewhat prolonged campaign against Caractacus, an important square camp, capable of resisting a sudden attack, was made at Brandon. Other good examples are to be found at Caistor, Norfolk, and Sherwood Forest;\* but the following, often called "Roman," would seem rather to be "Romanised"—Castle Acre, Yarmouth; Egbury, Andover; Grimsby, Newbury; Godwin, Painswick; Masbury, Shepton Mallet; Perborough, Hampstead Norris; and Roundway, Devizes. As a general rule, those made distinctly for military purposes along the great roads were about twenty miles—or a day's march—apart and were square. Those that were occupied temporarily, or re-made from existing earth castles, may be identified—

1. By actual Roman remains, such as wheel-turned pottery, scattered coins, and oyster shells.

2. By their being in the neighbourhood, and especially at the intersection, of undoubted Roman or Romanised roads.

3. By Roman names when such are traceable, or by survivals thereof, such as Street, Stone, Stretton, Wick, Cold Harbour, etc.

The legion† was the tactical unit of a Roman army, and consisted, under Julius Cæsar, of ten cohorts of infantry of about 360 men each, and each divided into three maniples. Under the Empire the cohorts ordinarily numbered 600 men each, the first cohort of each legion, however, being double the strength of the rest. Cavalry and light troops were attached to each legion, but were invariably recruited from among the provincials; while the legions, though recruited in the provinces as a rule, and very rarely indeed in Italy, contained only Roman citizens, for the most part, no doubt, of provincial descent. The military colonies, composed of discharged soldiers, to whom land had been granted by way of pension, must have afforded excellent recruiting grounds; and while the legions were kept in the same province for years in succession, recruits raised in one province were commonly sent to serve in another, in order to check the growth of a spirit of nationalism in the army.

In battle each legion would be drawn up, ordinarily, in

\* Archæologia.

† The above account is based on W. Rüstow's *Heerwesen und Kriegführung C. Julius Cæsars*, Gotha, 1855.

two or three lines of cohorts (*acies duplex, triplex*). Spaces were left in the front between the cohorts, the lines being so drawn up that the intervals of the first were in front of the cohorts in the second, and *vice versa*. All the infantry were armed alike—with shield, sword, and *pilum*, a lance some six feet in length, with a heavy head of soft iron, hardened only at the point. Each cohort was ordinarily ten ranks deep. Advancing till within ten or twelve paces of the enemy, the first rank of the first line of cohorts would hurl their *pila* with the design, not unfrequently successful, of spreading confusion in the ranks of the enemy. For these weapons, apart from the grievous wounds they could cause, would often stick in the shields, when the heads would bend and drag the shield down; and meanwhile, the soldiers of the first rank, who had thrown their *pila*, would spring forward and attack with the sword, while the second rank, after hurling their *pila* over the heads of the first, would strike in as opportunity offered to fill the places of their dead or wounded comrades. The rear ranks acted both as a reserve and “a wall behind which exhausted warriors could find shelter,” and, in the last resort, they served to cover the retreat. The heavy load carried by the Roman soldier did not materially lessen his mobility. The cavalry, which was stationed on each flank of the legion, watched the enemy’s cavalry, in order to prevent its charging or outflanking the Roman troops, and in case of a victory followed up the retreating foe.

This arrangement, the account of which is based mainly on the recorded battles of Cæsar in Gaul, may or may not have been exactly followed in the British wars, for all “drill formations” must have then, as they do now, depended on the nature of the ground, and it is clear that much of the country was at that time densely forested, ill-drained, and with much marsh land.

There is practically no detail of any Roman battle fought on British soil, but it is stated that, when three legions were sent to collect forage, the cavalry, which seems to have been Gaulish horse, were sent to guard them and scout. Similarly in the advance against Cassivelaunus, the cavalry crossed the Thames ford at Cowey Stakes, followed by the legion in close order; but in such a cramped *terrain* the cohorts must have crossed in succession to form line on the

network of military roads as straight as hands could make them. How they were so driven through wild forest, thick marsh, and pathless downs it is very hard to tell. But the Itineraries of Antonine, dating about A.D. 320, show fifteen great itinera, or military ways, of which six converge on Londinium, and three on Calleva (Silchester), from which, in addition, start two others not in the Itineraries. Sorbiodunum (Old Sarum) is the meeting-point of six, and one runs in a perfectly straight line to Axium, on the Somersetshire coast, near where is now the pretty village of Uphill\*.

In all, there are some 218 Roman stations known in Britain, of which two (Verulamium and Eboracum) are municipal towns; and nine (Aquæ Sulis, Camboricum, Camulodunum, Glevum, Isca Silurum, Lindum, Londinium, Rutupiae, and Deva) were *coloniæ*, having the rights of Roman citizens.

Probably for the first two centuries these stations remained unwallled, even if converted into permanent towns. It is difficult otherwise to account for the complete destruction of Verulamium, etc., during Boadicea's rising. But as the country became more settled, the wall of stone either supplanted the rampart of earth, or, as at Silchester, the Roman Calleva, grew up inside the earthen vallum of the Attrebatian town.

These fortified cities were formidable. They were still rectangular, if not square, and had also the four entrances of the Roman camps they superseded, these being now provided with gates and gateways, often flanked with towers. Many of these were, as at Richborough, round and solid at their base. The walls themselves consisted of two parallel facings of stones, roughly squared, inter-stratified with tiles, often laid in herring-bone fashion, the space between being filled up with rubble and mortar. Where tiles were not readily available, as at Silchester, rows of flat stones were substituted.

Roman arms in Britain are much the same matter of conjecture that they are elsewhere; but it is hard to imagine on what ground it is assumed † that iron weapons characterised the Teutonic rather than the Roman race. That the armour, whether of plates, or bands round the waist and chest and over the shoulders (*Lorica*

\* Colt Hoare, vol. i., p. 38.

† Bontell and Llewellynn Jewett.

*pectorale* and *humeralia*), or of pieces of metal sewn on a leather coat (*Lorica squamata*), may have been of brass or iron is evident. Either metal would serve the purpose of defence.

But as the long-shafted pilum was without doubt of iron, so it may be assumed that the short hand-to-hand gladius was of steel, as the broad parazonium, or dagger, was. The high civilisation of the Roman implies the knowledge of how to make steel, and this is the true metal for offensive tactics. The pilum was like the bayonet, the gladius like the cavalryman's sword—weapons for close quarters; and thus the best method of fighting, before heavy missiles were used in war was the method of fighting best calculated for disciplined and organised troops. Whatever metal it was made of, it hung on the right side, so as not to interfere with the shield (*clypeus*, of iron; or *scutum*, of wood and leather) carried on the left arm. A statue in the London Guildhall Museum shows this. Arrowheads of iron, introduced from, if not entirely used by, the auxiliaries of the legion, have been frequently found, as in the excavations at Vindomis; but there is no evidence that the legionary was so armed.

Bronze weapons have lived on, and are found solely because they are less liable to rust. Saxon swords of iron in a tumulus are usually entirely destroyed. Mediæval arms and armour have suffered in the same way, but in their case they have been converted to secular uses, if not to ploughshares and pruning-hooks.

Of the standard, or signum, of the legion, one undoubted, if not unique, example has been found in the ruins of Silchester. It was of special importance in Roman warfare. Its loss was dishonour; on it the military sacramentum, or oath, was taken. On many coins it is shown as a bird with wings horizontally stretched; but on Trajan's Column it is carved as one with wings standing vertically, as if the bird were swooping down.

The bronze eagle now at Strathfieldsaye is but the body with a square socket at the base to hold the staff; but in the upper surface of the back are two square holes, in which the wings were socketed; and, from their position, these latter must have been vertical. Whether, as has been suggested, the wings were of precious metals, or only of bronze decorated with wreaths of gold or silver for victories won, is unknown; but it



is possible that in the troubles of Carausius and Allectus the body of the eagle may have been hidden away, and the remainder of the signum taken or lost by an auxiliary. Hidden as it was, buried in the ashes of a wooden roof or what not, it represents the end of the days of Roman rule in Britain.

Long before the last legion left for home, sea pirates of all sorts—Saxons and Norsemen, Jutes and Angles—had troubled the repose of the Count of the Saxon shore. The mighty Empire of Rome was falling to pieces at last, and Honorius, to strengthen its feeble heart; recalled his legions from all distant shores, and left Britain to self-government, self-defence, and despair.

THE earliest trace of art in Britain hardly perhaps comes within the scope of our history, for it takes us back to the palæolithic era, when men had not yet learned to polish the chipped flint implements which served for all their needs. The range of these primitive wanderers was wide, and they have left their stone arrow-heads and hatchets in half the river-drifts of the world. It was, however, only a section of their descendants, the men who made their homes in the caves of North-Western Europe, who possessed the rare gift of artistic design. These Cave-men of France and England were the "Greeks" of palæolithic humanity, and it is to one of them that we owe this convincing proof of the antiquity of art on British soil.\* It consists of an exceedingly spirited sketch of a wild horse with an upright or hog mane, etched with a flint point on a fragment of rib, and was found in the Robin Hood Cave in the Cresswell Crags, on the dividing line between Nottingham and Derbyshire. It was buried under many feet of rocky deposit, so hard as to require blasting, which itself underlay a dark stratum of earth containing fragments of Roman pottery. This unique specimen has indeed a special value, for it conclusively connects the inhabitants of what is now England with the hunters and engravers who lived in the caves of what is now France. These were the men who etched the

**R. HUGHES.**  
**Art and**  
**Architecture.**

**Palæolithic**  
**Period.**

\* Boyd Dawkins, "Early Man in Britain," p. 185.



contemporary mammoth on his tusk, and the reindeer on his antler, and wore as necklaces or amulets the engraved teeth of the Cave-lion. It is necessary to be guarded in our geography in dealing with the people of this ancient time, because our modern England was then but the centre of a broad promontory divided by a narrow sea from Scandinavia, while neither the English Channel nor the Bay of Biscay was in existence. But these gifted savages passed away, leaving us in utter ignorance of their appearance and their habits—of all, in short, except their genius in art; and though a hazardous attempt has been made to connect them with the Eskimo, it is probable that no existing race can claim to be of their descendants or their kindred.

It is otherwise with the next race, the long-headed and short-statured people who, after an interval the length of which we leave geologists to fix, inhabited England—and England practically as we know it now. Possibly among the small dark Welshmen and the black Irish of the West the type of these people may still survive; and there is less doubt that the swarthy Silurians, whose obdurate ferocity, not more than their unlikeness in character and physique to the Celts of Gaul and Britain, so deeply impressed the Roman invaders, were their lineal descendants. Probably they were a non-Aryan people, akin to the Basque or Tchudic races; and their sepulchres, in the shape of the famous long barrows, are with us to this day. Though still ignorant of the use of metals, they had learned the art of grinding the flint, and their polished stone implements, their axes and their knives, are of excellent workmanship. In some respects they were comparatively advanced, but in artistic matters they were far behind the dwellers in the caves, who, with all their talents, had neither hut nor sepulchre. Unlike the Cave-men, all the Neolithic races were ceremonious with the dead, and it is on their tombs that we find the first trace of the modern decorative feeling. Some of these tombs, which also served as crematories, are not only flagged and chambered, but elaborately ornamented with whorls and spirals. They had learnt the art of making pottery, though without the potter's wheel, and of decorating it, though only with the simplest geometrical forms.

**Neolithic Period.**

**Tombs.**

It is not until after the arrival of another race—a tall, round-headed people whose affinities are uncertain—that any advance in the rudimentary arts takes place in Britain. Whether the new-comers were the vanguard of the Celtic army, or a hybrid race, or a tall Finnish stock, it is not necessary to determine; but we may note as evidence in favour of the latter view that the Aryan has not, as a rule, been a tomb-builder, as this early Briton emphatically was. In default of more precise information, these two races—the short-statured, long-skulled people and the tall, round-skulled race (though conceivably two families may be covered by the latter description)—can be conveniently distinguished as the people of the long and of the round barrow, though the latter may belong to two stocks, or two divisions of the same stock. The long barrows are plentiful, but the round are still more numerous, crowding every spot sacred to the elder race. It was these people of the round barrows who brought us the use of bronze, if not the art of making it; and with the age of bronze we enter the domain of consecutive history.

Pottery in Britain at this epoch is still hand-made, but it exhibits considerable skill in the making. The shapes are good, and some examples are of considerable dimensions, approaching three feet in height. The variety of ornamentation also is, within certain limits, extraordinary.

**Decorative Art.** We find food-vessels, cinerary urns, drinking-vessels, and the somewhat mysterious perforated cups which have been variously taken for lamps and incense-burners, but which are now generally believed to have been fire-baskets for conveying the lighted embers to the funeral pile. The patterns are generally made up of straight lines, arranged in crosses (of which there is an endless variety), in network, and in zigzag; sometimes with toothed impressions filled with white, or diversified with alternate cut and raised squares, and rows and groups of dots—round, oval, and triangular. Sometimes, too, we find impressions of a withe or twisted thong, and in one case a braid of three distinct plaits is clearly visible. Though the results are so various, the method of making seems to have been of extreme simplicity, the patterns having been worked either with some pointed instrument, or by pressing a notched stick or braid

against the wet clay. Curved and circular patterns indeed exist, but they are far from being common, and more probably indicate a later date; but there is never any trace of the attempt to delineate animal or vegetable life. Nor is there much change in the character of ornament as the Bronze Age becomes more completely developed; the advance being shown by the increasing substitution of metal for bone and horn, stone and clay, rather than by any progress in the taste displayed in working it. The decoration of the bronze is also geometric, and so remains until the coming of the Iron Age, though the increased desire of personal adornment is attested by elaborately graduated necklaces of imported amber, by the frequency of rings and armlets, and by stone wristlets adorned with gold, or with the mixed gold and silver which the native workers had not yet learned to separate.

Britain, moreover, is now entering on the period of written history. It is impossible to be sure that our shores were not touched on by the Carthaginian Himilco, though the identification of his *Æstrymnides* with the Scilly Islands must be abandoned; and if, as is likely, they were reached soon after by other Sidonian navigators, no record has come down to us. But in the fourth century B.C., probably before the death of Alexander, Pytheas, a citizen of the Greek colony of Marseilles, had certainly visited Britain, and the account of his voyage in search of new markets became the centre of a literature, partly romantic and partly serious, which served for the next four centuries as the general storehouse of information about these islands. This was the case with numerous writers of Imperial times, some of whom, like Strabo, persistently decried Pytheas and his travels. It is to one of the compilers of this period, Diodorus Siculus, a contemporary of Juvenal, that we owe the preservation of a most interesting story. He tells us—quoting from Hecataeus, a writer whose work is openly founded on Pytheas—that Britain is the birthplace of Latona, and in consequence that Apollo was honoured there above all the other gods, and, more remarkable still, that he possessed in the island “a magnificent sacred enclosure and a remarkable temple of circular shape.” Of course, this may be a mere coincidence, but one cannot help remembering the

**Beginning of  
History.**

existence of Stonehenge. That extraordinary erection sufficiently answers the description in Diodorus, and whether referred to or not, it was certainly the greatest architectural effort of the early Britons. It is unnecessary to discuss whether it was erected as a place of burial or a place of worship; for among rude races the honours paid to the dead ancestors are apt to blend inextricably with those paid to the living gods. But the people who raised these great trilithons in the centre, and ringed them round with that gigantic palisade, had a fine sense of what constitutes imposing architecture. Moreover, the large upright blocks which form the circumference bore imposts dovetailed into each other so as to form a continuous architrave, evidence that the methods as well as the spirit of architecture were then in course of development. An examination of the tombs in its neighbourhood—some of which seem later, some older, than the temple—point to its being a work of the bronze epoch; nor does its method of construction, any more than its conformation, justify the opinion put forward by one archæologist—that it is subsequent in date to the Roman invasion. Later in date than the vast stone circle of Avebury, which from time immemorial has been quarried by the inhabitants of the district, it was probably somewhat earlier than the Age of Iron, the next chapter which an examination of British soil opens to the reader.

That age could not have been many centuries old at the time of Cæsar's landing, for bronze was not wholly superseded. But the introduction of iron produced vast improvement in the tools of the craftsman, and in this way made a considerable difference in the art, though hardly in the architecture, of Britain. But the improvement in design is not less striking in the Iron Age than the improvement in manufacture, though the former seems to have been rather the result of external influences than of esoteric development. The Celtic population, albeit the date of their coming is a matter of controversy, had by that time consolidated a great part of their conquest: yet fresh swarms must have for a long time been passing from the mainland and establishing the various kingdoms which the Romans found. This close intercourse between the Continental and the island Celts would naturally lead to the export into Britain of products

which the former obtained from adjacent and more civilised communities, and it is precisely at this time that we meet with metal work distinctly borrowed from southern forms. The gold corselet disinterred at Mold in North Wales, the gold cup found in Tipperary, are obviously copies of Etruscan *repoussé*, and may be matched by finds at Corneto and

Celtic Art.

Metal Work.

Præneste; while the British metal work of this period includes, besides Celtic torques and bracelets, rings and safety-pins and brooches, which loudly proclaim their foreign parentage. Combinations of the spiral and the volute, and various examples of flamboyant tracery, now become abundant, many of their forms being of extreme beauty. Such are the designs on the famous head-ring dug up at Stichel in Roxburghshire, and on the dagger-sheath found in the river Witham. Moreover, these patterns continued in use far on into historic times, and in combination with Italian and German forms reappear in Missal drawings centuries later. Another important feature of this age, the practice of interring the dead in stone chambers with a complete equipment of the weapons and ornaments that were theirs in life, has greatly added to our knowledge of the arts and culture of this period. In some cases the corpses or the ashes were deposited in megalithic tombs, the finest examples of which are found near the Boyne, in Ireland.

Tombs.

One of these (at New Grange) is a cruciform structure, ninety feet long, made of large blocks embedded in a cairn seventy feet high, with a long passage leading to a lofty dome at the intersection of the arms of the cross, and the entrance stones ornamented with groups of most elaborate spirals framed in lozenge or zigzag borders, of a character unknown in the preceding age. Probably these tombs are of somewhat later date than the barrow at Mold which produced the gold corselet we have mentioned, and near which three hundred amber beads were found, while a few yards off was an urn full of ashes. This is also true of the tombs explored near Market Weighton, where cremation seems not to have been practised. In one of these last was a skeleton with weapons, a wooden shield with a bronze boss in the centre and a rim of iron, a horse-bit, and the wheels of a chariot. In another, in addition to the human bones, were the skeletons of two ponies, and iron and bronze

chariot ornaments. In another, where the body was, according to expert opinion, that of a woman, were hundreds of glass beads (blue and green, and with white lines through them), an ivory carving, two enamelled bracelets, and rings of red amber, bronze, and gold. The production of glass has generally been contemporaneous with the smelting of iron, so that these beads may possibly be of British origin.

But the skill shown in the manufacture of ornaments is far in excess of that exhibited in the humbler work of domestic architecture. Indeed, whether they were lately-arrived Belgæ, Celts of a new or old migration, or swarthy Silurians of a still more ancient stock, the Britons whom the Romans encountered possessed, apart from their tombs and temples (some of which may even then have been prehistoric), no architecture at all. Their round dwellings, though in the north occasionally of stone (owing, no doubt,

**Dwellings.** to the scarcity of workable timber), were usually made of stakes interlaced with boughs, and seem to have resembled, though they probably did not equal in neatness, the like constructions in a Zulu kraal. The mimic Camulodunum which, at Claudius's triumph, was erected in the Campus Martius, to be stormed and defended by British captives, was intended to be a facsimile of the British capital, and we know that it was but an affair of palisades surrounded by artificial water, of reed-thatched palaces and streets of wattled huts.

**Coins.** The coinage of præ-Roman Britain is a somewhat difficult field of investigation, and indeed Cæsar asserts (Bell. Gall., v. 12), if we admit Scaliger's reading to be correct, that the country had no coined money. Probably the British Celt was in this respect somewhat less advanced than his Continental neighbours, but still the art of coining was not altogether unknown. Some British tribes certainly seem to have had a coinage of their own in gold, and possibly in tin, at a date which may not unreasonably be fixed at a hundred and fifty years before Christ. The coins appear to have been mostly copies, though hardly at first hand, of the beautiful stater of Philip of Macedon—a coin which, it is supposed, came abundantly into Gaul as part of the spoil of Brennus. But though our coins seem to have been copied from Gallic imitations of a genuine Philippus,

there are indications that these imitations were themselves of early date. This is shown by the fact that many of the British versions are fair though imperfect likenesses of the original; while in the later Gallic coins, such as were in use in the time of Cæsar, the original design had, through ignorant repetition, practically disappeared. Thus the beautiful head of Apollo on the Philippus, his wreath and his curls, had become replaced by a series of unmeaning lines and crescents; while the charioteer in his biga (which forms the reverse) had, after passing through a preliminary stage of a burlesque man-headed horse, come to be represented by fragmentary limbs and unintelligible bunches of pellets. This is true, too, of some of the British coins, and, in a case mentioned by Mr. Evans, the head may still be recognised, but the horse has been so much altered that its neck and body have been mistaken for the golden sickle used by the Druids for cutting their sacred mistletoe, while the mistletoe itself has also been found in one of the bunches of pellets which are merely the *disjecta membra* of the charioteer. It may be added, however, that the tradition that there was a horse somewhere seems never to have been quite lost by the British artists, and occasionally there was an attempt to make a fresh start in the shape of a sketch from nature of the animal at a gallop, though the result was hardly satisfactory. The early British coins, though comparatively neatly executed, are uninscribed, though it is possible that there are exceptions to this rule. But after the coming of Cæsar and the imposition of tribute, legends identified as referring to various kings and minting-places, such as Cunobelin and Camulodunum, become common. Of course it must be understood that what we have said in regard to these coins refers mainly to the coast Britons—that is, to the Celtic inhabitants of the south and east—and has no application to the wild Silurians of the west, who were ignorant of the use of money at least as late as the time of Vespasian.

It was a rude people such as we have described that Julius Cæsar encountered, though the tribes with which he came into contact represented the Romano-British  
Period. latest immigrants, and, presumably, the most civilised inhabitants of the island. But there was nothing in the barbarous arts which they displayed to attract the



attention of the patrician soldier, bred in the material luxury of Rome, and familiar from his youth with the glories of Athens. As a warrior he admired the skill and courage of the British charioteers, which reminded the educated Roman of the heroic combats of the *Iliad*; but neither in Cæsar nor the later commentators on Britain do we get anything but the sparsest reference to her civilisation. One of his few references of the sort is in the passage in which he describes (though evidently confusing them with the bison of Lithuania) the wild cattle of Britain, the progenitors of the herds of Chillingham and Chartley. He mentions particularly the great spreading horns set in silver, which he seems to have seen, and which he describes as being eagerly sought after by the natives and used as drinking-vessels at their gluttonous feasts. The corselet of British pearls which he suspended in the Temple of Venus suggests, no doubt, a certain skill in the jeweller's art, though Pliny seems to have doubted whether it was not a fraud, both he and Tacitus referring to the bad colour of the pearls of the British Ocean, in which they are corroborated by the later testimony of Ælian. In the century which separates the flying visits of Cæsar from the partial conquest of Aulus Plautius and the triumph of Claudius, the improvement in the arts of peace in Great Britain could not have been rapid. The native kings, whose frontiers varied with the chances of intestine war, may, as we gather from the tablet of Ancyra, have obtained the contemptuous friendship of Augustus, have propitiated the favour of Rome by embassies, and have dedicated in the Capitol the gold work of Britain. But except that they seem to have learnt to inscribe names on the native coinage, there is no evidence of any forward step in art or architecture.

Still, the invasion, no doubt, gave a stimulus to trade with

the Continent, and Strabo speaks of the ivory

**The Roman  
Conquest.**

bracelets, the amber, and the glass which at

this time formed the staple of the commerce

with Celtica. The immigration of Gallic settlers assumed, no doubt, increased proportions, and these brought with them fresh examples, which the natives were not slow to imitate; and it is likely that the armour which the Parisian settlers of Yorkshire decorated with coral from the Mediterranean was emulated by the natives in the red enamel in which their

proficiency became notorious. Sheaves of unfinished sword-blades of a Gallic pattern have been found in quantities in the south-western counties, and may reasonably be adduced as another testimony of British progress in an essentially Gallic art. The commerce in articles of more or less artistic character was at any rate sufficient to provide the chief part of the tribute, which was apparently onerous neither in its amount nor in its collection. The duty on these imports and exports was, in fact, regularly collected; but beyond this, Britain was not oppressed by the arms or influence of Italy.

Far different in result was the invasion of Aulus Plautius in A.D. 50. The eleven years which followed saw the extirpation of the Druids, the rising and fall of Boadicea, and the laying of the foundations of the Roman dominion. By A.D. 86 Britain was, to all intents and purposes, a Roman province, studded with fortified towns, and covered by the network of roads which, in all countries, was the sign of a permanent Roman occupation. But the Romans, great engineers as they were, and sound, if not talented, architects, were essentially an unartistic people; and the art which they introduced had its roots far away in that Greece which had long ago "led captive the taste of her savage conqueror." An army of officials was spread over the length and breadth of the land. Villas sprang up where the wattled houses had formerly stood, and the natives began at first hand to flatter their conquerors by imitation. Nor was it the least curious effect of this contact with Rome that it made the Britons idolaters, in the sense of worshippers of graven images. Before the coming of the worshippers of Mars and Apollo, the inhabitants of these islands seem never to have attempted to represent the human form for any purpose. The sacred oak-tree, the spring, the Easter sun, served as emblems for the primitive worship of the inhabitants; but the spectacle of Italian paganism, by this time largely tinctured with Eastern forms, seems to have awakened their imitative faculty. They, too, set up temples and carved idols, such as those which Gildas describes as still visible in the ruined towns, or which, built into city walls and gateways, roused the astonishment of our earliest antiquaries. Of the nineteen bronze images dug up at Devizes, in the beginning of the last

**Romano-British  
Art.**

**Sacred Art.**

century, a large proportion represent British, not Roman, divinities. The crested snake or dragon plays a great part in the early art—sometimes associated with the nude, sometimes twined round figures draped in the Celtic tunic and breeches. The Romano-British artist must, indeed, have had extraordinary familiarity with the attributes of deity in far-distant parts of the world, and his work attests the curious popularity of the worship of Mithras and Serapis. Inscriptions and tablets to “Sol invictus Mithras” are quite numerous, and it would almost seem as if the native saw some connection or kinship between these strange Oriental worships and the corrupt Nature-cult of his own Druidism. He was even set to carve altars with Greek inscriptions, though we may safely attribute these to the piety of foreign legionaries. Among those found near the Wall of Hadrian, one is privately dedicated to Astarte or Ashtaroth, the Phœnician Venus. Another is dedicated by “Diodora the High Priestess to the Tyrian Hercules”—that is, to Melkarth the God of Canaan, whose temple by the rock, to which the Saracens later gave the name of Gibraltar, was the most famous of the outposts of Carthage. The foundations of a temple of Serapis have been explored at York, a city which has also revealed to us the image of that Bellona to whose temple Severus was conducted by the mistake of a rustic soothsayer shortly before his death. Naturally we come across many altars dedicated in Roman fashion to Roman gods—to Jupiter, to Fortuna, to the Genius Loci, to Victoria Victrix, to Hercules, to Mars, to Mercury, to Silvanus and the Nymphs, and to the Numina Augustorum. But the British and Gallic Olympus are equally well served, and the native deities were considered good enough company for the great gods of Rome. Thus we have an altar inscribed to Jupiter and Mars jointly with Nemetona, a war-goddess of the Gauls. The god Nodens or Nodons had a temple at Lydney in Gloucestershire, and Epona the horse-goddess was a favourite everywhere. Besides these, a hybrid race, such as Mars Lucetius, Sul-Minerva, Mars Belacatrudus, and Jupiter Dolichemus, also found work for the British statuary. The *decæ matres* of Italy, of Africa and of Gaul, also had their altars on British soil, erected by devout persons who thought it unnecessary to individualise. The desire for compendious piety is also carried out with a fine largeness of handling in a dedication to “the

gods of the generals' Prætorium," punctured on brass in Greek uncial letters, and in a marble tablet "dis deabus hospitalibus penatibusque." Nothing, however, shows more clearly the catholic comprehensiveness of the Roman religion than these inscriptions to all sorts of gods, of all sorts of foreign nations, while the piety of the native who erected an altar to "Britannia Sancta" indicates the extent to which the paganism of Rome had taken hold of the conquered people.

The sculptors who made these altars and carved these appeals to the strange gods of Continental Europe were, there is every reason to think, of British nationality; and there is some evidence of the existence here, during the times of the constitutional emperors, of those *collegia* or guilds of artificers from whom the trade corporations of the Middle Ages may be said, without much straining of language, to be descended. Nothing as yet labelled with the distinctive mark of the Guild of Sculptors has been discovered, but a tablet was found at Chichester recording the erection by the Collegium Fabrorum (probably Craftsmen's Guild) of a temple to Neptune and Minerva.

This is not the only sculptured evidence of the existence of this guild, which probably embraced the builders—*i.e.*, the carpenters, and the professors of many other arts and trades. But the Chichester inscription is the most famous, because of its recital that this temple to two purely Italian deities was erected by the authority of a British Prince, Tiberius Claudius Cogidubnus, who appears to have accepted the dignity of a *legatus* while continuing to assert his own title of *rex*. Of course, "works of religion" have ever taken the first place among art-products, and this is true of Britain, of Greece, of Italy, and of Spain, and true of them both in ancient and mediæval times. But the iconoclastic fury of successive creeds proved more fatal to the gods than to their worshippers; and of these sacred statues, which must have been counted by the hundred, strangely few have come down to us. Of life-size statues there are hardly any, the statue of Mars found at York, and made of native sandstone, being almost unique.

Of altars worked in relief the number is greater, though few are of the highest quality. A good example of this class is that dedicated to Æsculapius and Salus, where the right hand of Æsculapius grasps the left hand of Salus, his own left

lying on the neck of the sacred serpent. This curious piece, found at Binchester in Durham (the ancient Vinovium), was due to the private devotion of a surgeon in the Spanish cavalry.

It was not, of course, in the matter of religion only, that the Roman colonist brought Rome with him  
**Architecture.** wherever he went; but the scarcity of good workable stone, the abundance of oak timber, and the differences of climate unquestionably modified the nature of his domestic architecture, as it certainly increased its liability to destruction. Probably the resemblance between the domestic architecture of Imperial Italy and that obtaining in her northern provinces was closest in the cities. Unfortunately, it is the cities in England that have suffered most; for not only were they quarried for centuries for the sake of their materials, their Roman brick and mortar, but in many cases not one alone, but several towns have successively grown up on their sites, burying their precious relics under layer after layer of subsequent foundations. The Saxon town of St. Albans is supposed to have been entirely constructed out of the ruins of Verulamium; and the casual passer-by at the present day can see that the walls of the tower and transepts of the Norman cathedral are in large part composed of Roman tiles. In Rome itself the beautiful hewn stones of the Imperial architecture have been built by the thousand into the walls of the palaces of princely Papal families (*quod non fecerunt barbari fecere Barbarini*); and so in England the brick and marble and terracotta of innumerable Roman villas and temples have gone to serve the base uses of English castles and churches and homesteads. The country villas have,

**The Roman Villas.** however, suffered far less from disturbance and overlaying. They are, as a rule, somewhat smaller in dimensions than those of more southern lands, and they show, perhaps, less opulence of material. But even in exposed positions of the country, like Cumberland, where the danger of Pictish raids was chronic, there are remains of highly-ornamented brick and stone; while the mere existence of towns like Silchester, where the walls enclosed an area three miles in circumference, indicates the probability of more or less general luxury.

It has, indeed, been said that probably no rich citizen would

have chosen to spend his life so far from Rome, and under a British sky, and therefore our villas probably were the homes of men of small fortune; but, on the other hand, there is nothing to show that the Romanised Briton was not allowed to retain all his wealth, and the officials of the Empire were largely recruited from among the inhabitants of the outlying provinces.

In weighing the differences between the Roman domestic architecture of Britain and the same architecture in Italy, it is well to bear in mind that even in its native country the buildings varied considerably in plan. The principal parts of an ideal Roman town house consisted of an *atrium* or hall, entered from the *ostium* or porch, and which was originally the chief room in the house. It was roofed—either wholly or so as to leave only a hole or sky-light in the centre—and in large houses the roof was supported on columns. Behind came the *carædium*, which was the inner court, the real centre of the establishment, having a large open space or *impluvium* (with a cistern or fountain) in the centre, not roofed over, enclosed on all sides by covered passages; and beyond this was the *peristylum* running at right angles to the other rooms, in the middle of which was a garden surrounded by a pillared arcade. Built off from the *peristylum* were the *triclinia* or dining-rooms, of which there were several, and in very large houses various *œci* or reception-rooms. At the time, too, to which we may refer the construction of most of the British villas—that is, the second, third, and fourth centuries of our era—the *Œcus Clycenus* was a great feature of the Roman house. This was usually a rectangular room at the back of the *peristylum* or garden court, and its special feature was that on two sides of it, if not on three, were windows reaching to the ground, so that persons reclining there could enjoy, while sheltered from the heat, a view of the open country outside. These were the principal apartments, and round the three first lay the *cubicula* or the sleeping-apartments—usually of very small size—the store-chambers, the kitchen, and the offices.

A different arrangement prevailed in the country houses, which consisted of two courts: an outer one, where were the bailiffs' apartments and the rooms of the prædial or farm slaves, the wine and oil presses and the kitchen, and an inner court, something like a farmyard with a watering-place for cattle, stables, and other agricultural buildings. The residential



part of the villa was usually built with a portico or colonnade running along the front of it, and with rooms roughly following the plan of the town mansion, but permitting the interpolation of smaller *peristylia* behind the hall and the addition in front of the court of the house of a large banquet-room constructed on the same principle as the *Æcus Cyzicenus*. We may assume, too, that the country villa invariably possessed bath-rooms on a considerable scale, with the hypocaust or heating apparatus attached.

The dwellings in Roman Britain do not seem to have conformed strictly to any of these types. The two chief cities, however, the earliest British *municipia*—York and St. Albans, as we now say, Eboracum and Verulamium, as the Romans called them (and the former of which was during the whole period of the Roman occupation the foremost city of Britain)—have not afforded us exact information as to the form and dimensions of the buildings. Nor has London, which, though not a *municipium*, was evidently a great commercial centre, an Imperial mint, a city entitled to call itself Augusta, and a *depôt*—perhaps the principal *depôt*—of the Imperial treasure. The country villas, on the other hand, built of wood on brick or stone foundations, have, it is true, disappeared from above ground, but below, their ground plan can generally be recovered, and they are our most trustworthy witnesses to the character of Romano-British civilisation. The type of villa prevalent in Britain may be judged of from numerous specimens, particularly those unearthed at Lydney Park and Woodchester in Gloucestershire, at Bignor in Sussex, and at Brading in the Isle of Wight. In all of these the regular sequence of rooms has disappeared, while the living-rooms of the villa are arranged along the sides of a large open court, varying from sixty to two hundred feet in length, and of a square or oblong shape. These are sometimes (as at Bignor) paved with slabs, and always surrounded by an arcade, which in some cases is doubled through a great part of its length. A hall, more or less answering to the *Æcus Cyzicenus*, and generally facing more or less south, may in most cases be identified. The bath arrangements are usually separate and of a most elaborate character, and the hot air is transmitted not only into a few small rooms, as was occasionally the case

Roman Town  
Architecture.



in Italy, but was carried under the floors of all the principal apartments. Open fireplaces also occur, and though here and there the existence of a fountain may be detected, the *impluvium* as an institution seems to have been abolished. In one point, however, they resemble—and, indeed, frequently excel—in beauty all but the very finest villas which have been discovered on the Continent. This is in the splendour of their pavements. In this branch of art the British artists were certainly a credit to their Roman teachers, and their tessellated work (the *opus musivum* or *musaceum* of the Romans) is not only of great beauty and ingenuity, but occasionally possesses an almost national character. No other Roman remains are so well preserved, owing in great part to the special care taken to preserve these from the effects of the British climate. The setting and cement were attended to as carefully as the design, the bed being of lime and fine sand or ash, and the cement of “pounded slate, white of egg, and gum dragon.” Cubes, mostly half an inch to an inch long, were used, and Dr. Lysons, the explorer of Woodchester, calculated that, in the mosaic there, not less than a million and a half of *tesserae* were employed, the materials being mostly native products, though occasionally we meet with a white calcareous stone, suggestive of an Italian origin. Most of them, too, were built on a platform of tiles resting on supports of brick or stone, and into the hollow space the hot air of the hypocaust was usually conducted. When this was for any reason impracticable, the thickness of the foundation was enormously increased; and foundations of this sort three feet thick have been found at Wroxeter, once the populous city of *Uriconium*, while at Woodchester a thickness of no less than five feet was reached.

Mosaic  
Pavements.

The south-western and southern counties have furnished us with the best examples of this art, but there is no part of England where they are altogether unknown. Those at Lydney and Woodchester are deservedly famous, but they are excelled by the series found at Brading, which may fairly gauge the excellence to which British artists attained in this class of design. We have already described the general plan of the villas, and though the explorations have not yet fully elucidated the arrangement of the Brading villa, the room

with which the series of mosaic begins there, seems to have been one of the interpolated apartments of which we have spoken. In the centre is the head of a woman, whom Mr. Morgan (from whose valuable work these details are in the main taken) considers to be Harmonia. Around her are grouped three tessellated pictures, expressive of different divisions of the day. The early morning is indicated by the gladiators brought out by their managers to fight with beasts—the morning being the hour for the man-and-beast fight, the *lever du rideau* of the amphitheatre—while the combat of man with man took place at the more fashionable hour of noon. The time of day is further identified with the *gallicinium*, or division of the day beginning with cockcrow, by the presence of a man with the wattled head and spurs of a cock. The next scene is noon, and here we see the *secutor* with sword and helmet, trying to escape from the net thrown by the *retiarius* and to cut him down before he has time to throw it again. The third division of the day is shown by the fox stealing into the vineyard at nightfall. It is perhaps only right to mention that these ascriptions are not universally accepted, and that the man-cock has been variously and hazardously interpreted as a symbolical insult to St. Peter and Christianity, as Alectryon, and as a pictorial impertinence in the nature of a pun on the name of the Emperor Gallienus. More doubt is cast on Mr. Morgan's interpretation by the fact that the wild beasts are panthers, the sacred beast of Bacchus, and have wings. In the centre of the long gallery—doubtless such a banquet-hall as was usual in a country villa—is Orpheus in a medallion, with his Phrygian cap and lyre, and the beasts around him. This is much mutilated; but the fragments of the Orpheus and beasts among them—which seem to have included a fox, a peacock, a Cornish chough, and a monkey—show that they were well designed.

The northern room, of uncertain denomination, is not in good condition; it seems to have consisted of four parts, of alternate squares and oblongs, which Mr. Morgan has most ingeniously interpreted as a decorative rendering of the Dionysiac legend. Of the first of these the centre is gone, but the figure carrying a head is recognised as Agave, with the head of her son Pentheus, whom, in the madness sent by the god to avenge his insulted majesty, she mistook for a

wild beast. In the next oblong is the figure of an astronomer with his instruments around him, while beyond there seems to be a continuation of the Bacchic story. In the centre is a head variously considered as that of Medusa or of Pentheus, and radiating from this are four medallions. In one of these is Lycurgus, with the axe given him by Juno to slay Bacchus. Then there is a Nymph pursued, with her drapery torn and flowing (probably a further part of the Dionysiac legend), and in the last medallion is Staphylus (the vine), as a youth with a Pan's pipe, and a Nymph with a tambourine—symbolical of the happiness which comes of the right worship of the wine-god.

The proficiency of the British artist, and the extent to which the art must have been practised, may be guessed from these details, which, it must be remembered, represent only a part of what has survived in one of the many villas scattered throughout the country. These, indeed, are so numerous that anything like an exhaustive sketch of them is impracticable. We may note, however that as a rule mythical legends are the first choice of the designers. The demigods, the Naiads and the Tritons, and Orpheus with his lyre, are the most popular figures; Bacchus with his panther, Mercury, Cupid, and Pan are also common. The great gods are rarer, Neptune and Jupiter being most often met with. Jupiter is found at Bignor with Ganymede, and with Mars at Frampton. Venus and Mars and Diana are also found at Bramdean. Apollo is hardly known, unless some of the supposed figures of Orpheus were meant for him. Representations of birds and beasts are tolerably common, and there are hunting and fishing scenes, though they are not numerous. One of the most interesting of these is in the mosaic discovered at Lydney, where fishermen in their leather coracles (the rude oval boats still in use on the Dee) are depicted, one of them being in the act of landing a British salmon. Scenes from the arena are rare; only a few such, besides the one at Brading, are known. One of these is at Bignor; and, oddly enough, while the beasts at Brading have wings, at Bignor the gladiators are thus equipped. The borders of these mosaics are also often extremely elaborate. That at Woodchester, for instance, shows on a grey ground in the first place a red border, then a line of bricks of two colours, then the Greek

or key pattern, then a broad twist or braid ; next comes a series of most intricate squares and medallions, then another plait, then a foliated arabesque, then a narrower braid, then the procession of beasts, and, after more plaits, the procession of birds, to whom Orpheus is playing. The centre is lost, but in the square corners are elongated human figures or genii, arranged with exquisite feeling for decorative effect.

When the wooden walls of the villas—which, as we have said, were raised on brick or stone foundations—fell in, the pavements were covered up with the *débris*, and were soon smothered with vegetation, which formed a soil, preserving them from the violence of the weather and the more destructive violence of man. The public buildings, being in towns, were not thus protected, and have suffered accordingly. Of these the baths have had the best fortune, and in places like Aquæ Sulis, or Bath, the remains are still visible, and in some cases in actual use. Theatres and basilicas and *prætoria* there must have been in abundance ; and though of the latter several foundations have been discovered, only one theatre has been certainly identified. Of amphitheatres, too, which were a

necessary ingredient in the life of every true Roman, and which, owing to their size, shape, and position, were less likely entirely to disappear, there is only a meagre list. They were in the main seemingly earthen structures, rarely faced with stone, and, unless the great cavity at Cheriton be the site of one of them, did not equal in size those of second-rate Gaulish towns, such as Orange and Vienne, not to speak of Arles and Treves. This disappearance, though not unaccountable, is exceedingly unfortunate, particularly in reference to the Christian architecture of the time. We know that long before the time of Constan-

**Baths, Theatres  
Amphitheatres.**

**Sacred  
Architecture.**

tine churches were plentiful, and that those destroyed in Diocletian's persecution (when Constantius was governor) were rebuilt (as Bede expressly states) when, in the reign of the son of Constantius, Christianity became the State religion. Many more must have arisen when the pagan rites were forbidden, and during the century and a half—in some parts of England two or three centuries—which elapsed before the arrival of that pre-eminently destructive people the pagan English. Destructive as their paganism was, probably their conversion and the

erection of their churches on the old sites was still more destructive to the evidences of British Christianity. But, whatever be the cause, the fact is that of the ecclesiastical architecture of Christian Britain scarcely one authentic fragment has survived. St. Martin's Church at Canterbury, a church at Reculver, another at Dover, and possibly the Abbey of St. Albans, may perhaps contain consecrated fragments of Roman-British origin. A coin found at Cirencester (having on the reverse the sacred monogram of  $\Lambda$  and  $\Omega$ ), some Christian symbols inscribed on stone, a portion of a doubtful sarcophagus, and a palm-branch roughly scored on a sepulchral slate — such are the vestiges of Christian art and architecture in Britain. This is true not only of the reigns of the Christian Cæsars, but also of the period of quasi-independence before the Roman civilisation was drowned in the flood of English barbarism.

Though glass of every kind seems to have been manufactured by the British provincials, they do not seem to have given much attention to art **Pottery and Metal-Work.** pottery. The Samian vases with their fine red glaze, though made elsewhere than in Southern Europe, never seem to have been manufactured here. The best British manufacture was the figured ware made at Durobrivæ or Castor, near Peterborough. It is not of great beauty, but finer than the ordinary English pottery, for the manufacture of which extensive works existed in Lincolnshire, Hants, Somerset, Worcestershire, Northamptonshire, and Essex. Terracotta toys and statuettes were also manufactured; metal-work too, both in iron and bronze, and occasionally in gold, has been discovered, and rings and brooches, mirrors and spoons (resembling the old Apostle spoons), in immense variety. Except in small works of this kind, bronze in Britain belonging to this period rarely reaches a high standard, the very fine pieces discovered being almost certainly due to some of the hungry Greeklings of Imperial Rome, and transported thence by their Roman owners.

Of course the soil of Britain, like the soil of other provinces of the Roman Empire, teems with Roman **Roman Coins.** coins. The list is fairly complete from the time when Augustus gave the world its law in Rome to the time when Honorius shivered in Ravenna. But only a small

part of these are the indigenous mintage of Britain. It is not important to discuss whether the coins of British kings, made chiefly in Verulamium and Camulodunum, were the work of British or Roman artificers. There is but little doubt that Agricola, at any rate, established regular Roman mints in the quieted province; there is none that they existed at a somewhat later date, and were in working order in the second century. Hadrian's exploits in Britain and elsewhere are written in his coinage, and the commonest of all our Roman coins are those of Antoninus Pius, which frequently show on the obverse the figure of Britannia seated on a rock with a shield at her side and a spear leaning against her shoulder. Other indigenous coins belong to the reigns of Commodus and Severus, of Caracalla ("who assumed and polluted the respectable name of Marcus Aurelius"), of Geta, of Diocletian and Maximian (whose coinage is scanty), of "the glorious usurper" Carausius, of Allectus (who betrayed and murdered him), of Constantine the Great, of Fausta his wife, of Crispus and Constantine his sons, the list ending with the younger Constantius. The greater part of these belong to the mint of London, established in the reign of Constantine, which apparently superseded the older places of manufacture. The coins vary in fineness of execution—the gold being generally excellent work, the silver not unfrequently rough, and the brass occasionally barbarous. But however inferior in point of mechanical finish they may be, in boldness and vigour of design they fairly put to shame the coinage of our own day. Even those not struck but cast, either by forgers, or in irregular mints set up to supply the temporary needs of temporary governments, are usually of respectable quality.

FROM the earliest times there was a belief that a happy land, full of pearls and sunshine, lay far out in the Western Ocean. The first wall of its king's palace was coated with brass, the next with tin, and the third flashed with the red light of orichalcum.

During the decay of the Phœnician cities, when all the isles of the ocean mourned over the fall of Tyre, the Greek and the Roman longed for a share in the Phœnician trade with the mysterious tin islands of the west. During the lifetime

**O. M. EDWARDS.**  
**British Trade and**  
**Industry.**



of Alexander the Great, and of Aristotle, about 330 B.C., the Greek colonists of Marseilles fitted out an expedition for exploring the Western Ocean. The command was given to Pytheas, who had won renown by his studies in mathematics and navigation. It is from the fragments that remain of his works that we get our information about the earliest stage of the history of British trade and industry. He saw the abundant wheat of a Kentish harvest, he was struck by the great barns in which the corn was threshed, he tasted the mead made of wheat and honey, but did not visit the interior, and did not see the tin mines.

Two hundred years after Pytheas, the geographer Posidonius, Cicero's tutor, visited the west. Expecting, probably, to find the islands of the ocean even richer than the farthest regions of the mainland—the soil of which glittered with silver, tin, and white gold—he crossed over to Britain, and pierced further into the west than Pytheas had done. He saw the more savage life of the interior, and visited the tin districts of Cornwall. He found the tin-

**Tin.**

workers hospitable, civilised, and expert at their work. The ground is described as rocky, but containing earthy veins, from which the tin was ground down, and smelted, and purified, before being made into knuckle-shaped slabs for transportation. It was carried in waggons, during the ebb of the tide, to a neighbouring island, whither the merchants came to seek it. The tin island has been supposed by different writers to be St. Michael's Mount, the Isle of Wight, and the isle of Thanet. From it the tin was carried in ships to the coast of Gaul, and thence overland to the Rhone Valley and Marseilles.

During the three hundred years that elapsed between the visit of Pytheas and the Roman intercourse the trade and industries of Britain must have

**Towns.**

developed very rapidly. Pytheas says nothing about towns: in his time, probably, there were only huge hill-fortresses, into which a whole tribe fled for safety in time of invasion. By the time of the Roman Conquest, inhabited towns were taking the place of these hill or marsh fortifications. The intercourse with Greek and Roman merchants was closer, as the number and character of British coins show. The Britons' first standard of value was cattle, and perhaps bars of iron



or small slabs of tin. About the time of Pytheas' visit, or very soon after, they had coins in imitation of Greek coins. It is supposed that they began by imitating Gaulish copies of the gold stater of Philip II. of Macedon. Later, they coined silver and bronze. Before the Roman Conquest they had begun to letter their coins, in consequence of the growing intercourse with the Roman conquerors of the mainland. The corrupt Greek models were no longer followed, and British kings described themselves, in imitation of what they saw on Augustus' coins, as "Tincommios Commi Filius," or "Cunobelinos Rex." Cæsar, however, in a passage which has certainly been altered (B. G., v. 12), says that the British money was either brass or oblong pieces of iron of a certain weight.

Before the Romans came, iron as well as tin was found and manufactured in Britain. Cæsar says that iron was found on the coast, but only in small quantities. There is no doubt that there were ironworks in the Severn valley before the Romans began to work them or to tax them.

At first British weapons were made of bronze, and probably imported. But, before the coming of the Romans, the bronze axes had been discarded in favour of the new iron swords and spears. These were at first imported from Gaul, but the Britons soon learnt to manufacture them for them-

**Handicrafts.** themselves. The sword-blades were iron, manufactured in the south-west of the island; the sheaths were bronze, and the hilts were beautifully decorated with studs of red coral. The scythe-blades attached to the war chariots of Cassivelaunus were undoubtedly of British manufacture.

In the earliest Welsh romances—romances full of pagan reminiscences, long anterior to the Arthurian cycle—the western parts of Britain are regarded as the home of skilful handicraft. The fashioning of iron cauldrons, the enamelling of sword-hilts, the colouring of sword-blades, the sharpening of whalebone javelin-points, the dyeing of shields, the plying of crafts bordering on magic, are generally associated with the west. One romance describes the journey of needy kings of Dyfed into Llœgr, plying a craft. They came first as saddlers, and their saddles were so beautifully coloured that none could be sold but theirs. Driven into another place by the jealousy of the saddlers, they tried shoe-making, with the same

success, on account of the beauty and excellence of their work. They had also succeeded as manufacturers of shields, which they could work in blue enamel.

The romances are full of legends concerning the beginnings of agriculture and stock-farming. Hugh the Mighty is described as bringing the plough Agriculture. into the Isle of Britain, and many a legend is connected with the first sowing of seed. At the dawn of historical times, all animals that have been domesticated at all were in domestic use among the Britons. Probably the last to be domesticated were swine and bees, and concerning the domestication of these we have legends. Swine were first brought into Britain by Gwydion ab Don, and he stole them from a kingdom lying on the border of Hades. Bees, on the other hand, were a gift from Heaven, and a mediæval Welsh poet refers to the legend in his description of snow-flakes—

“ Bees from Heaven, so white, are they.”

On the eve of the Roman conquest, Britain was rich in agricultural produce. Whatever invaders had come into the island, Cæsar says, they had given up war for tillage. The island was densely populated, Cæsar thought, the buildings were numerous, and the number of cattle great. Among the agricultural exports were cattle and hides, and wheat and barley, of which there was abundance in the island. British hounds were highly prized, being used in war by the Gauls and in the chase by the Romans. Slaves were probably exported, and the slave-trade was not condemned until St. Patrick censured the Welsh king of Ceredigion for selling Christian slaves to the pagan English.

In exchange for these exports, the Britons obtained manufactured iron and bronze articles, pottery, salt, and manufactured cloth. It is known, however, that they had, besides iron articles of their own, pottery of native manufacture, and coarse cloths which were gradually coming into use instead of skins. Pliny, who wrote between the first and second Roman invasions, describes the texture of the cloth from which the Briton's sleeved jacket, trousers, hat, and cloak were made. It was a coarse felt, and so thick as to be a protection against a sword. The cloth was worked in glaring colours, and the Briton seems to have been excessively vain. His favourite

dress was one of striped cloth, containing little squares of all bright colours. The favourite colour seems to have been flaming red. Dyes were obtained from the bark of various trees and from lichen; lichen is still used in Wales as a dye, and it produces a very lovely colour. The gold torques and rings were probably of native manufacture; but the glass beads, with which the Briton so loved to decorate himself, were probably brought by Greek merchants from Egypt. From time immemorial the Britons had beads of amber, jet, and various stones; they wore beaten gold and silver on their coats of various colours; they had pins and brooches made of polished boars' tusks. The smith was in the highest estimation, and the potter, as yet without his wheel, could produce vases and cups of various kinds.

Cæsar says that Britain contained all the trees of Gaul with the exception of the beech and the fir. Tacitus heard that all ordinary produce could be found in Britain, except such as that of the olive and the vine. The vine was introduced by the Romans, and the vineyards of the south-east had not become quite unimportant even in Norman times. In a Welsh poem written in its present form in the thirteenth century, there is a description of a battle between trees. The birch is there, but the fir is still probably a stranger; the pear-tree is newly introduced, and the plum-tree is scarce.

Internal communication was carried on by means of rivers and of ridge ways. On inland rivers the **Inland Trade.** coracle was used—a small round boat, with a keel of thin planking and sides of basketwork covered with hides. The inhabitants of the south-western parts, especially, were good sailors. The Gaulish tribes of Morbihan summoned them to their aid against Cæsar, who gives us a description of their ships. The ships were adapted both for coasting purposes and for putting out into the deep sea. Their bottoms were considerably flatter than those of Roman ships, in order to be able to land everywhere and to pass over shallows. Their poops and prows, on the other hand, stood high out of the water, in order to withstand the storms of the open sea. The vessels were strongly built of oak, the cross-benches were fastened by iron spikes, and the anchors were secured by chains of iron, and not by ropes. Their sails were raw hides—often painted blue in order to escape observation at a

distance. Cæsar does not think they used hides because they had no canvas, or were unaccustomed to its use. They probably thought that no canvas sail would be strong enough when such huge vessels were battling against a storm. The ships were too strongly built to be injured by the beaks of the Roman ships, too high to be caught by grappling irons, and excellently fitted for fighting among shallows and rocks. They were manned by intrepid sailors, who would dare to put out into the Irish Sea even in open boats. The commercial intercourse between Britain and Gaul explains the coming of the Romans, as the like intercourse between Wales and Ireland in later times explains the conquest of Ireland by the kings of England.

The two important rivers in the history of British commerce are the Thames and the Severn. On the bank of each of these rivers a temple had been erected to Lud, the god of commerce. On a hill on the western side of the Severn, in Gloucestershire, where the river is tidal, the fisherman and the merchantman sacrificed to Lud. The place—Lydney—still bears the god's name, and the remains of the temple have been discovered. Another temple stood, undoubtedly, on a hill by the Thames, still called Ludgate Hill. It might be mentioned, also, that the Welsh name for London is *Caer Ludd*—"Lud's town." In British legend, Lud was his people's protector and the cause of their prosperity. He has a silver hand; he delivered his people from three scourges; he had twenty-one thousand milch cows; he was famous among the gods for his generosity and for the prosperity he caused. He has a fleet, and occasionally appears as a god of war. King of the Orkneys, with a temple at the mouth of the Severn and of the Thames, his reputation undoubtedly grew with the increase of British commerce, and the Roman merchant came and worshipped at his altars.

When the Romans conquered it, Britain had ceased to be a land of sunshine and pearls. Tacitus knew that the ocean produced pearls, but of a dusky and bluish hue. Nevertheless he thought that the island contained gold and silver and other metals, as the prize of conquest. The Romans did much for British mining, and especially for internal traffic. But tin, lead, and iron had been worked, perhaps, centuries before they came. The Roman invasion helped the development of

British trade and industry, but the development was proceeding steadily before they came. Military conquest followed in the wake of Roman commercial enterprise.

Summing up, we may say that, before the Roman conquest, there was commercial intercourse between all the tribes within the island of Britain, for we find the coins of the south-eastern districts in the valley of the Severn and in the valley of the Clyde. There was also a close commercial intercourse between the western coast and Ireland, and between the whole length of the southern coast and Gaul. The exports were almost entirely raw produce, the imports almost entirely manufactured goods. Still the Briton wove cloth of various colours, manufactured gold ornaments and iron weapons, and was expert in enamelling and in the manufacture of chariots. When the Roman came, he found that the tin mines, the gold mines, and the iron mines were being busily worked. The Roman occupation put an end to the native coinage, but it greatly developed British agriculture and manufactures, and greatly extended British trade. And the sway of Lud's silver hand became wider than ever.

IN spite of all the civilising power and appliances which the Romans brought to bear upon their province, it must have been widely different in appearance from the land which we know. Centuries of drainage, of tree-felling, and of road-making have altered our country to an immense extent. A thousand swamps, which the old roads had to bridge or to avoid, have disappeared. The land was then covered with deep forests, of which only fragments survive in parks, or memories in such names as "the Weald" of Kent. Through these forests the Romans cut their long, straight highways, but the primitive wood stood close on either side, and the Stone Street, across Surrey and Sussex from London to Chichester, must have been like our shadowy New Forest roads. Wild beasts there were, such as have now vanished. The beaver dammed the streams; wolves wasted the flocks all over the island, bears remained in some parts; red deer were common. Near Durham has been found a tablet of thanksgiving to Silvanus, the hunter's god, dedicated by a Roman cavalry officer, who had killed a wild

**F. T. RICHARDS.**  
**Industry and Trade**  
**in Roman Britain.**

boar of remarkable size, "which many people before him could not bring in." The Romans are said to have introduced fallow-deer, pheasants, hornless sheep, geese, and fowls; but the evidence is, perhaps, not conclusive for all these things. Nor can we be sure, though it is possible, that they began some of the embankments which protect our low grounds against the sea or against river-floods. The climate was much what it is now. The Romans were pleased to think—and they were right—that they held the best part of the island; but they noted of the climate that it was "rather rainy than snowy, and, when it is fine, there is a fog." The goddess of ague, Tertiana, was not worshipped for nothing. Vines were introduced later: olives would not grow, but corn and timber thrived. The island was "very woody," and produced, as we have seen, all the trees of Gaul, "except the beech and the fir," and in excepting even these Cæsar was possibly mistaken.

Having no vines, the island had to import wine; and ivory and amber also occur in a list (obviously very imperfect) of its imports. To set off Industry and  
Trade. against these, corn may have been one of the chief exports. The export trade in corn with the Continent began before the Roman occupation, but was no doubt methodised and extended by the new government. An historian of about A.D. 380 speaks of "the corn supply usually brought over (to Gaul) from the Britons," indicating that the supply was a regular, not an occasional, one; while another writer of about the same time shows that the corn (or some of it) was habitually sent from Britain up the Rhine. But so much of this corn as was *annona* (p. 22) was, of course, not paid for. Another thing by the export of which the province was able to pay for what it imported in the way of wine or other foreign luxuries, was its metal. The mines were often, though not perhaps invariably, in the hands of the Roman government, but no traces have been found in Britain of such elaborate organisation of the mining community as the records of Vipasca, in Spain, show us. Roman mining tools have been preserved in the galleries of the Mendip Hills, and elsewhere have been found bars of silver and tin, pieces of copper, and blocks of lead. The pigs of lead were often dated in the mould, and we see from them that the Romans lost no time in exploring the resources of a new province. The conquest

began in 48 A.D., and there is a mass of lead from Somerset with a date equivalent to 49 A.D. The lead came partly from the Mendips, partly from Derby and other counties; the tin is from Devon and Cornwall. The lead was so abundant that the output was limited by law—in order, we may suppose, to keep up the price. Copper was got from Anglesey and Shropshire. Beds of iron scoræ, containing coins or other Roman remains, tell where iron was extracted in the Forest of Dean, in Herefordshire, and in Monmouthshire. The Sussex clay-ironstone was known, but was not worked on so large a scale as afterwards by the English from the thirteenth to the eighteenth century. It may well have been these beds which Cæsar had in mind when he said that iron was got in the coast region. Gold and pearls, we suspect, were more often talked about than found. But cattle and sheep, skins or furs, and slaves were regularly exported, as also wild beasts for shows at Rome.\* British dogs were valued abroad for hunting; and hunting scenes with dogs are not uncommon on the British pottery of the age. A Roman satirist speaks as if Kentish oysters were well known on dinner-tables at Rome toward the end of the first century. The value of jet and of “Kimmeridge coal” for ornamental purposes was well understood; jet ornaments have been found in graves of this period, but there is nothing to show that jet was exported. Nor is it likely that British coal was then sent abroad, although it was certainly burnt on British soil. Coal ready for use has been found among the fortifications of the wall in Northumberland, and reminds us how Wallsend (the Roman Segedunum) has been famous for coal in modern times. Of woven fabrics we do not hear that any were exported from Britain; but still of home labour and of products for home consumption there was no lack. The stone-cutter was a busy man. Slates were dressed for roofing; bronze articles were probably cast here as well as imported. Beer was brewed. Glass and pottery were made in large quantities, so that the importation of glass, which an early writer mentions, may have ceased to be necessary. The red earthenware, called Samian, was very possibly imported; but the coarser kinds of pottery were made in many parts of Britain. Kilns

\*The wild beasts, however, may not have been paid for.



for making them, and even parts of makers' stocks, have survived. Among the chief centres of production were London; Upchurch, on the Medway; parts of the New Forest; Dymchurch; and Castor, in Northamptonshire (*Durobrivæ*?). Pottery, too, of many more or less artistic kinds was either made in Britain or at least valued there. An enormous trade was done in bricks, and in tiles for building, flooring, or roofing. These were made by soldiers for military purposes, but also by manufacturers, and probably in any part of the country where suitable earth could be obtained.

Whether here, as elsewhere in the Roman world, trade gathered itself into guilds or corporations, we do not know. Two inscriptions, which seem to speak of *collegia* of smiths, may perhaps mean only army-smiths.

We cannot, on the whole, think of Britain in the first centuries after Christ as a very rich province, but it is one of the provinces in which the existence of a wealthy class has left the plainest traces. This class may be accounted for by wealth made in business, by wealth seized in war, or by the salary and emoluments of office. The bodies and the huts of the poor have alike Roman Villas. crumbled away and left no trace; but the tombs of the well-to-do survive to show us their jewellery, and there is no country within the Roman Empire in which the remains of Roman town houses and country villas are more numerous or finer. These ruins are now found underground, sometimes in our towns, sometimes well out in the country away from any modern building, and with nothing to draw attention to the spot save the oyster-shells which the plough brings to the surface. But it will generally be found that these country houses stood near, not on, the line of a Roman road, so that an easy approach was secured. They prefer a west or south aspect, and always have plenty of water in the neighbourhood, or even brought on to the premises in pipes. Baths formed a regular part of such houses; just as many inscriptions referring to larger baths being built or rebuilt, show how important bathing was thought to be wherever bodies of men were gathered together, in towns or on the lines of the great fortifications. The profound peace of the inner country is indicated by the fact that none of the country houses show any traces of having been fortified. In spite of

the decay of centuries, we can often still follow the ground plan of the villa, see the arrangement of small sleeping-rooms and store-rooms round a quadrangle, and find our way to the reception- or dining-rooms. The well can be cleared out, and yields very curious finds. We can explore the system of warming the house—more applicable to a one-storeyed building than to a building of many floors. Below the ground was a low crypt or series of chambers placed underneath the living-rooms. Slaves, told off for the purpose, kept up great fires in these vaults (the *hypocaustis*), and the hot air was made to circulate in pipes under the floor and round the walls of the rooms above. The risk of fire was diminished by using pipes of thick pottery.

The mere size of these houses is in some cases worth noting. Built low, they naturally spread out ; but, even when we allow for that, we shall find that the area covered by the structure and its outbuildings indicates great wealth and great numbers of slaves. The buildings at Woodchester, which have never been explored to the end, are known to stretch 330 feet in one direction and more than 300 in the other. But the glory of the villa is usually its tessellated or mosaic pavement. Such pavements have been found in England of great splendour but even the simple geometrical patterns, in quiet and harmonious colours, are pleasant to the eye and creditable to the taste of the designer. The fragments of painted stucco which have been found in the ruins show how the walls were decorated internally. Slices of foreign marble, as a wall-decoration, though not unknown in Britain, are very rare. They were probably too costly. None of the houses have yet yielded anything to show the name and quality of the owner, but the signs of taste and wealth are generally unmistakable.

There is no more splendid pavement than that of Woodchester, in Gloucestershire, on which the figure of Orpheus appeared in the midst of his birds and beasts, placed within a most elaborate design of conventional ornament. The pavement at Bignor has the four seasons, represented by human heads with symbols, a figure of Ganymede, and groups of gladiators. At Brading the mosaic bears dancing figures, and other designs, whose meaning is not so clear. Other good pavements have been found at Cirencester, Handboro' (in Oxfordshire), York, Leicester, Canterbury, London, and Frampton

in Dorset). Among the other representative remains of the Roman period, we must mention the earthworks of Northumberland (the masonry of the wall is mostly gone), the camp at Housesteads, the market-place at Chollerford, the Roman bath in the Strand, and the imposing walls of Porchester, Richborough, and Pevensey (Anderida). Nothing gives one a better idea of the greatness of scale in what the Romans undertook than to see the Norman castle lost, as it were, within the enclosure of Pevensey. Among the best of the collections to which the finds of miscellaneous objects have made their way, may be mentioned the museum at the Guildhall, London; the collection of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, to which have flowed so many curiosities from the line of the Roman wall; and the Shrewsbury Museum, where most of the objects from Wroxeter (Viroconium or Uriconium) have found a home. The museum at Reading is acquiring the movables found in the systematic excavation of Silchester (Calleva). But it is likely that many grassy meadows and unsuspected mounds yet cover remains of bygone days.

The Roman occupation must have done a good deal toward making the mixed population of Britain more mixed still. New comers from any land under the Roman government might settle here. We find a Palmyrene at home under the pale sky of Northumberland, and a Moor or Mauritanian in the service at Ellenborough. The men of the legions, wherever they came from, were not of British birth—the officers might be of Italian origin; and the strong auxiliary forces—called Belgians or Batavians, Alpine troops or Spaniards, Gauls or Germans, Dalmatians or Sarmatians—whether they were really levied in the countries whose names they bear or not, were more or less foreigners, and must in some degree have mingled their blood with that of the people among whom they were quartered. But the whole population, including the foreign garrison and all its hangers-on, is not likely to have been very dense. The Roman towns, wherever we can trace their circuit, occupied a smaller area than the English ones which took their places in the seventeenth or eighteenth century; and the ability of the island to export corn is itself evidence of a thin population.

Foreign  
Admixture.

There can be no doubt that the British provinces, whatever their prosperity in the good days of the Empire, shared its degeneracy and decay, and suffered many evils from internal mismanagement and foreign aggression before the final withdrawal of the legions. It is possible, of course, that certain places known to us as thriving Roman towns may have begun to suffer, before the end of the Roman period, from the withdrawal of the sea, which brought them all their business. Richborough (Rutupiæ), Pevensey (Anderida), Lymne (Portus Lemanis), may already have found themselves silted-up and cut off from the open water by deposits of mud and shells. But the greater part of the mischiefs which affected the later Roman Britain must be put down to the folly or the violence of man. Particulars are wanting, but we hear dimly of internal troubles toward the end of the fourth century, of highway robbery, of the armies going unpaid, and of the men deserting. Moreover, the island was suffering at both ends from inroads which the government was no longer strong enough to beat off. From one quarter came the Picts, the Scots, the Attacotti, harrying the north and the midlands, while the south and south-east coasts had reason to dread the inroads of the "Saxons, who might come with any shift of wind." The *Comes Litoris Saxonici* had his hands full with these Saxons (or English), and with the Franks, many years before the final settlement of the former (A.D. 449). We hear nothing of ability on the side of the Romanised Britons to defend themselves. Here, then, by the final test of history, the Roman Government of Britain stands condemned. It found the natives warlike, though untrained; it left them helpless and unwarlike. The Empire brought with it all the benefits of peace; it introduced material prosperity and well-being; it offered the highest education and development which the times afforded; but, when it came to the actual test of manly excellence, the inhabitants of the island were found wanting, and a civilisation which was unable to defend itself perished by fire and sword.

Whether or not the Saxons utterly destroyed all traces of Roman civilisation in Britain, their work was at any rate very terrible. Even now the remains of the villas show how many of them were burnt down. The towns were taken one by one, though some struggled on, abandoned, but true to the Roman

tradition. Bath and Cirencester, Gloucester and Wroxeter, held out till near the end of the sixth century. But whether the towns held out, or whether they at once admitted English masters, they were ruined. They had formed parts of a highly organised commercial system, bound to all regions of the Continent by a magnificent network of highways. When the roads were neglected, when the communications were cut, and the stream of commerce dried up, the towns lost their very reason for existence, and ages passed before they found another. The mouths which trade had fed went unsatisfied; the sword was bare for centuries throughout the length and breadth of the island. The new conquerors were not merely conquerors; they were thoroughly out of sympathy with the inhabitants. The lands from which they came had been untouched by the greatness of Rome; they cared nothing for her institutions, her language, or her name. They were not, as the German invaders of Roman provinces on the Continent so often were, somewhat Christianised before they were let loose upon the country. Hence they were not to be mollified by religion or overawed by the clergy, and the destruction they wrought was thorough, because it was the work of foreigners, of savages, and of heathen. What is told us of one place by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle\* how “Ælla and Cissa besieged Andreds-cester (Anderida, Pevensey), and slew all that dwelt therein, so that not a single Briton was there left,” cannot have been true of all, but the spirit of it meets us everywhere. Many sites of Roman trade and civilisation have stood empty from that time to this. There is no cottage now within the walls of Richborough, and the water-birds could at one time lay their eggs undisturbed within the baths of Bath. Nor did the hostility of the new race to the old world end with the conquest. The modern inhabitants of Scotland may have treated the remains of classical antiquity with a spirit of “reverential enthusiasm,” † but in England the remains have suffered outrage upon outrage. Here they have been pulled down to repair a highway, to build a pigsty or a farmhouse; there, they have been dug through in search of hidden treasure; there, fear of magic has defaced the inscriptions and the carvings. Let us be thankful that we have yet so much of them left.

\* Translated in the “*Monumenta Historica Britannica*.”

† Burton’s “*History of Scotland*,” i., p. 47.

THE warriors drawn up on the cliffs at Dover to resist Cæsar's invasion on the 26th August, B.C. 55, were of various tribes united for the moment against a common enemy, and there is no reason to doubt Cæsar's description of them as being in respect of their customs much like the Gauls. This probably applies also to their costume; but the Celtic nations in going into battle stripped the upper part of the body, and this has doubtless given rise to the once popular belief that they were naked and woad-painted savages. Cæsar describes their handy and manageable wicker boats, or coracles, covered with skins, like those we even now find on the Welsh rivers; their terrible war chariots, with axles terminating in scythes, and the courageous and efficient use the Britons made of them in the field. Bronze arms have been found in their barrows or tumuli, and among their weapons of offence and defence variously shaped targets and shields ornamented with circles and bosses, leaf-shaped swords, daggers, lances, often with a hollow ball containing something to rattle at the reverse end, the bow and arrows pointed with flints or bronze, heavy clubs loaded with stone and attached to a thong. Besides these, they used slings, the "celt" of varying shape, which served as a battle-axe, the torque protecting the throat and neck, and armillæ with a like purpose for the sword-arm. Cæsar's three weeks' campaign in Britain was in the nature of a *reconnaissance*, and the difficulties he encountered caused him to make greater preparation for his second invasion, which was brought to an end in two months with the capture of the Oppidum of Cassivelaunus and the approach of winter. The conqueror seems to have used the British track-ways, forded the Thames—finding no bridges—and describes the country through which he passed as very populous—"hominum infinita multitudo."

The capital of Cassivelaunus was near where Verulam was subsequently built, and St. Albans now stands in the territories of the Catuvelauni. Among the tribes mentioned are the Trinobantes, now Essex, capital Camulodunum; and south of the Thames were the Atrebates, capital Silchester, and westward the Dobuni in Gloucestershire, capital Carinium or Cirencester; the Belgæ, also in the west, holding Winchester,



Venta Belgarum, and Old Sarum near Salisbury. The exact boundaries of these tribes it is difficult to fix with precision. Cantium, or Kent, appears to have been the most civilised. Besides other booty, and tribute afterwards levied, Cæsar is said to have brought back to Rome a corselet of British pearls, which he presented to the temple of Venus. Much has been said about British pearls, and it has even been supposed that they offered some inducement to the invaders, but as the pearls are also reported as dusky in colour, the Romans are more likely to have come with the object of punishing the Britons for helping the Veneti, or people of Brittany, in their revolt. Booty, however, and slaves, created the temptation to subsequent conquest, and knowledge of the country obtained by Cæsar paved the way for it. After Cæsar's retirement matters remained much as before in Britain, excepting that coins have been discovered bearing the name of Tasciovanus, possibly son of Cassivelaunus. These indicate the establishment of a mint at or near Verulam, and consequently show some social progress. The camps and entrenchments are found to this day. The Belgæ, who possibly were brought over by Divitiacus, king of the Suessiones in Gaul, leave traces of their extended lines of earthwork at Combe bank, Bockerley ditch, south of Salisbury, Old Ditch, north of Amesbury, and Wansdyke, which extends from Savernake forest in Wilts to the Bristol Channel. These are supposed to mark successive Belgic conquests. This last boundary line is in very perfect condition as it passes over the Wiltshire downs not far from Marlborough, and must have been a work of long and continuous labour.

Although Caligula contemplated an expedition to Britain, and received Adminius, who had been expelled by his father Cunobeline, it was not until the reign of Claudius that another effort was made to subdue the country. If the campaigns of Aulus Plautius, Ostorius Scapula, and Didius Gallus be followed in their struggles with the Silures, the people of South Wales, the Iceni, or people of Norfolk and Suffolk, and the Brigantes, or people of the north and midland counties, it will be observed that the Britons even in that early time did not seem to know when they were beaten, and had these tribes fully realised that union is strength, another result might have happened in the contest. As it was, it was



with very great difficulty the valorous tribes were subjugated. But valour disunited could, as the event proved, do nothing in the long run against the system and discipline of Rome. The story of Cartismandua shows not only the tribal disunion at this time, but effectively illustrates some of their habits and characteristics. As there were no cities in the interior of Britain before the Roman invasion, the luxury of the court of Cartismandua "may have had no existence except in the imagination of Tacitus"\*; "but the barbarian queen was doubtless rich in her palace of wickerwork, in a herd of snow-white cattle covering the pastures of the royal tribes, an enamelled chariot, a cap, or a corselet of gold. She was the chief of one of the many tribes of which the Brigantine nation was composed. In a time when every valley had its king, with an army of villagers, an ale-house council, and a precarious treasure of cattle gained and held by the law of the strongest, it was seldom possible for the nation to unite in any common design, even for the purpose of resisting foreign invasion. The gathering of an army was an affair of meetings and treaties and solemn sacrifices to the gods. When the sacred rites were fulfilled, the blood tasted, and the rival deities and chieftains united by a temporary bond, the noblest and bravest of the tribal leaders was chosen as a war king in general command; but as often as not the treaty failed, and the clans fought or submitted as each might feel inclined." Tacitus says "one great advantage of dealing with such savage nations is that they cannot act in concert; it is seldom that even two or three tribes will join in meeting a common enemy; so while each fights for himself they are all conquered together."

Cartismandua was of such noble blood as to be chosen to lead the national armies; she was married to Venutius, the chieftain of a neighbouring tribe and a skilful warrior. Nevertheless, she made her alliances on her own account, and Venutius seeing the hopelessness of a lengthened contest with Rome, and the profit and plunder likely to accrue from submission and alliance—doubtless great riches in her eyes—she entrapped Caractacus—said to be her son-in-law—with his whole family, and delivered them up to the invaders, with whom he had maintained a struggle for nine years. Caractacus was carried to Rome

\* Elton, "Origins of English History," p. 243.

and shown to the people with much pomp. The details of the ceremony are recorded by Tacitus. First came his officers and body-guard carrying his jewels and collars, the harness of his horses and chariot trappings, and the treasure which he had gained in the war; next came his brothers, and his wife and daughter; lastly, the chief himself, he alone being calm, while the others were weeping and praying for their lives. Cartismandua had gained a triumph for Cæsar; her arrogance increased with her riches, and she thought herself exempt from the laws of her tribe; she preferred an armour-bearer to her husband, and, although she held out against her husband and his allies, and even captured his family as hostages, she, in spite of Roman assistance, lost her country in the civil war. The Brigantines were then quickly absorbed and adopted Roman customs.

It was to Boadicea, the queen of the Iceni, that the Romans owed their greatest reverses in these islands. Prasutagus, the king of the Iceni, had bequeathed his kingdom to his wife and daughter and the Emperor jointly, but in the reign of Nero the Britons were treated with great oppression. Tacitus says of the Britons, referring to the legate, and the Procurator, the collector of the Imperial taxes, "the one preys on our blood and the other on our lands; the officers of the one and the slaves of the other combine extortion and insult; nothing is safe from their avarice, and nothing from their lust." Boadicea's claims were unrecognised by the conquerors, and her property was devoured by the priests. Protestations to Catus the Procurator only resulted in the scourging of the queen and the violation of her daughters—outrages which were committed in the absence of the legate Suetonius, who was then engaged in the destruction of the Druidical stronghold of Mona, and which caused a revolt, the capture of Verulam and London by the tribes, and the indiscriminate massacre of seventy thousand Romans. Suetonius returned, however, and, attacking the Britons under advantageous circumstances, defeated Boadicea with a loss of seventy or eighty thousand people of the tribes. It is said that the queen put an end to her life by poison.\* The founding of Camulodunum (Colchester) followed the victory, and became

\* Thousands of Britons were carried to Rome as prisoners and sacrificed in combats in the arenas and theatrical shows.

the head-quarters of the Fourteenth legion. But the episode, terrible on both sides, appears to have been of value as a lesson, for we find Agricola, Vespasian's lieutenant and legate, following up his great victories over the Ordovices and other tribes with a milder sway. The Britons, in fact, unsubdued by arms, were amenable to conciliatory measures, and where Agricola had found savages, he left a civilised people—a condition of things that endured for years after his departure. "Agricola made the tribute, the obligation of feeding court and army, endurable; before this the tithe-farmers combined to buy up the corn the chiefs had to buy back at ruinous prices—illicit contrivances for gain that were more intolerable than the tribute itself." The wall was commenced in the north to hold the Picts and Scots in check, and the legionaries, with more peaceful surroundings than heretofore, were occupied by reclaiming the waste lands and completing the admirable system of roads. The Britons now began to build comfortable houses and acquired many of the useful arts of Rome, and, indeed, some of the luxuries of civilised life, besides following out a system of education that led to the acquisition of the Latin language and literature. They even went so far as to adopt the toga, and indulged in the Roman fashions of baths and banquets. Before this time, however, the decorative arts of peace were not altogether unknown; the universal love of ornament common to all mankind, illustrated in the early Britons by tattooing, woad-painting and weaving cloths, such as they were, in stripes, bands, and chequers, had no doubt been developed. Pliny\* speaks of their knowledge, derived from the

**Costume.** Gauls, of herbs for dyeing purple, scarlet, and other colours. The cloak or sagum of hide had been superseded by that of cloth, blue or black; the predominant colour of the tunic or trousers, chequered as in the national dress of the Highlander, was red. Jackets to a little above the knee were worn, the hair was often turned back over the crown of the head, and the chin shaved, leaving immense drooping and ragged moustachios. Women wore long tunics reaching to the ankles, the *pais*, and over it a shorter one with sleeves reaching to the elbow. The dress of Boadicea described by Dion

\*—"Hist. Nat.," xvi., 8; xxii., 26.

Cassius was a tunic in several colours, in folds, and over it, fastened by a fibula or brooch, a robe of coarse stuff; her light hair fell loosely over her shoulders, and round her neck she wore a torque of gold, a collar of twisted wire or band of metal which was worn by men and women as a symbol of rank and command. So fond of these ornaments were the British that they would get them of brass or iron, if gold was not obtainable. Rings, bracelets, armlets, necklaces, brooches of silver and gold, brass beads and jet, also breastplates of gold, have been found in Gaulish and British tumuli. The dress of the Druids has been described; the bards—the poets and historians of Celtic peoples—wore blue robes; while the ovates—astronomers and physicians—wore green, the symbol of learning and the colour of the clothing of Nature.

It is to the period of adoption of Roman customs that we must attribute the merging of worships. The principal deities of the Britons related to the elements. “A blind people,” says the monk Gildas, one of the earliest chroniclers, “paid divine honours to mountains, wells, and streams”; their altars were pillars of stone **Religion and Ritual.** carved with the emblems of the sun and moon; they bound themselves by vows to the heavens and the earth, by day and night, to the rain, dew, and wind. There were wells in Britain the girls never passed without making the customary offering, such as tying bits of linen or worsted to the “rag bush” near as a tribute to the spirit of the waters. The superstitions of the Britons infected the Roman armies. Tacitus mentions a list of omens foreboding the revolt of Boadicea—“a moaning in the council house, a wailing noise in the theatre,” and in the estuary of the Thames was seen “the likeness of a sunken town.”

Whether or not we are to suppose that the marriage customs in Britain were similar to those obtaining among the other peoples of Northern **Marriage Customs.** Europe, as described by Tacitus, has always been a question of difficulty.

Cæsar tells us of the Britons that ten or twelve men were in the habit of living together, especially brothers, or a father and his sons, and that these people would have their wives in common, the children being reckoned those of the man to whom the woman was first given in marriage in each case—

a condition of society which is testified to by Dion Cassius or his abridger, Xiphilinus, and St. Jerome. Strabo refers to a similar statement to that of Cæsar, but doubts it, showing clearly that the pagan mind at that time revolted from the idea of such a custom. Xiphilinus reports a conversation between the Empress Julia Augusta and the wife of the British chief Argetacoxos, when the latter, being rallied about the marriages of her countrywomen, retorted on the empress that the laxity of the Roman matrons was much more indefensible. It has been thought that the Romans drew a wrong conclusion from the British mode of living being unlike their own, and from finding families huddled together under one roof. But the Romans had opportunities of studying the manners and customs of other rude tribes, and it should be remembered that Tacitus, in his account of the Germans, says, "that they are almost the only barbarians contented with one wife," though even here he records notable exceptions. St. Jerome's reference applies to the more northern part of Britain, while that of Dion Cassius and Strabo indicates Scotland and Ireland as the scenes of these matrimonial customs. At any rate, such various testimony leads us to believe in warrant for Cæsar's statement, although it may be impossible to localise the practices he mentions. Well-known modern researches, moreover, have provided us with ample evidence of various kinds of polygamy and polyandry in all ages, and among all the races of the world, even among peoples like the Nairs of Western India, who are more civilised in other respects than the Celts of Britain in the time of Cæsar. Some inquirers, indeed, think that the wives he mentions were also sisters; and that we have here to do with a form of "group-marriage"—a group of brothers, in blood or by repute, of whom each is reckoned as the husband of each of a group of sisters, to which a like qualification must be attached. Traces of such group-marriages exist in abundance, even in the history of the earliest Greeks and Germans, and the institution itself is still found, for instance, in Polynesia, in a different form, and among the Pueblo Indians of Arizona and New Mexico. Whether these repulsive forms of marriage are to be regarded as degenerations from an earlier monogamy, or advances from an earlier and completer polyandry due to scarcity of food and consequent female infanticide, is a much-

disputed question which does not concern us here. The prominence of women which we observe in Celtic life and worship is commonly a feature of societies of the kind just described. But since we hear nothing of a similar institution among the Celts of the Continent, it may be that Cæsar's statement refers rather to the subject population of the bond villages described early in this chapter, who, as we there saw, are racially distinct from their Celtic conquerors, and are remnants of an earlier and more barbarous population.

We need not infer, then, that such customs generally obtained, were even extensively followed, or applied at all to those inhabitants of Britain, the Gaulish and Belgic Celts of the southern portions of the island. In regard to their marriage ceremonies, it may be taken for granted that the earlier the periods the simpler these would be. It would appear from the so-called Ossianic poems to have been customary among the Celts on these occasions for the father of the bride to make a present of his own arms to his son-in-law. As all the Celtic nations took much delight in feasting, no marriage was solemnised without a great feast, to which all the relations to the third degree of kindred of both parties were invited by the bridegroom at his own house, on the day when the bride was conducted to it by her friends. When the parties were rich the pair made presents to their friends at this marriage festival; but when they were poor, the reverse took place, and each of their friends brought some wedding gift, according to their ability or their generous inclinations. At the conclusion of the feast, bride and bridegroom were conducted to their chamber by the entire company, with every joyous demonstration of music and dancing. On the morning after the marriage, before they arose, the husband made the wife a present of considerable value, according to his circumstances. This custom certainly continued as the *morgen gifu* to Anglo-Saxon times. The gift was reckoned as the wife's peculiar property. The wives of the Ancient Britons, especially of their warriors, had not only the management of their domestic affairs, but they had the care and direction of the whole concerns of the family committed to them, both within doors and without, the husband's employment being, for the most part, war and hunting. For other labour they



were at once too lazy and too proud. As the women among the Ancient Britons and other Celtic nations were generally of robust and healthy constitutions, leading usually simple, innocent, and rural lives, the troubles of maternity interfered little with their ordinary affairs; occasionally, however, we hear of them wearing girdles having special attributes, particularly as facilitating the birth of heroes. Such girdles, in fact, have been kept with care till quite recent times in many families amongst the highlands of Scotland. They were impressed with several mystical figures, and the ceremony of binding them about their wearers' waists was attended with words and gestures which showed the custom to be of great antiquity and indicated a Druidical origin.

It seems to have been the custom of the Celts to plunge their new-born infants into some lake or river  
 Childhood. in order to try the firmness of their constitutions and to harden their bodies—this even in the winter season. The Scandinavians used, it is said, to pour water upon the heads of their children as soon as they were born, and this long before the introduction of Christianity; but there is no certainty that this custom was observed in Britain. Before the introduction of Christianity the inhabitants of the northern part of Britain did not give names, it is said, to their sons before they had performed some brave action, or given some indication of their disposition and character; and, in confirmation of this, it is certain that all the names of Ancient Britons preserved by the writers of antiquity are significant in the British language, and indicative of personal characteristics. The custom undoubtedly lent itself peculiarly to the picturesque treatment of all subjects and persons by the bards in their poems, and may, indeed, have had its origin in the recitation of heroic deeds, which play no unimportant part in the developments and genius of a people. It will be observed that a relatively similar custom amongst most northern nations is their giving a qualifying name to their favourite weapon. It will not surprise us, then, to find parents hesitating to name a son until they were enabled to qualify him with some special and, perhaps, desirable attribute.

The early British matron, even of the highest rank, always nursed her infants, and would have resented in the greatest degree the delegation of this parental office to another woman.



We know little of the bringing up of the children. There is a story of Solinus to the effect that the first morsel of food was put into the infant's mouth on the point of his father's sword, with a prayer that he might prove a great and brave warrior and die on the field of battle. This seems more likely to apply to the races who succeeded them and the Roman occupation than to the veritable Ancient Britons. We are as much in doubt really as to the particular race alluded to when we are told, on the authority of Tacitus and Herodian, that valour in war was the most admired and popular virtue of the Ancient Britons, although probability makes the statement the more acceptable generally. It is said that their natural courage, arising from bodily vigour, was raised to an enthusiastic height by many powerful incentives. They were accustomed almost from their infancy to handle arms and to sing the glorious actions of their ancestors. The young were thus inspired to feats of strength and to be engaged in war. As they advanced in years they were, while being instructed in martial exercises, also taught that everything in life depended on their valour—the praises of the bards, the favour of the great, and the applause of the people, and that happiness after death was the reward of those only who were daring in war. It may be considered certain that the youth of Britain at this period were not delicately nurtured; a rough and hardy people would not educate their children in a manner unfitting for their surroundings and way of life, and doubtless—as in Germany—the families of the nobler sort were brought up with no more delicacy or tenderness than the common people. Tacitus says of the Germans, "In every house you see the little boys, the sons of lords and peasants, equally sordid and ill-clothed, lying and playing promiscuously together on the ground and among the cattle, without any visible distinction. In this manner they grow up to that prodigious strength which we behold with admiration." The sons of the ancient Germans, Gauls, and Britons of all ranks were allowed to run, wrestle, jump, swim, climb, and to engage in vigorous exercises at their will and without restraint until they approached manhood.\* To this continued exercise,

\* Throwing or putting the stone—an exercise still practised in the north—may be traced to these early times. A stone was placed at every chieftain's door, and the stranger was invited to try his strength and skill in throwing.

together with the simplicity of their diet, is ascribed by Cæsar the great strength of body and boldness of spirit to which these nations attained. Cæsar says that when the youth of Germany, Gaul, and Britain began to approach the manly age, some more attention seems to have been paid to them by the public and their parents than previously, for when the son was younger it was accounted a shame for a father to be seen in his company. Children who were designed for the priestly order were then put under the direction of the Druids for their instruction in the sciences and in the principles of law, morality, and religion, while those who were intended for a warlike life—according to Cæsar—had arms put into their hands by their fathers, or nearest kinsmen, in a public assembly of the warriors of the State or clan. Some vestiges of this custom continued till later times—especially with respect to the eldest sons of lairds or chieftains—in some parts of the Highlands and western isles of Scotland.

Some of the customs in relation to war are noteworthy.

**Warfare.** When an unfortunate chieftain implored the protection and assistance of another, he approached his place of abode with a shield all bloody in one hand to intimate the death of his friends, and a broken spear in the other to represent his own incapacity to avenge them. Also when the warlike tribes were summoned by some chief to repel a hostile invasion, or sudden need came for them to engage in some expedition, besides sounding the horn and striking the shield, to warn those who were within hearing, he sent the *Cran-tara*, or a stick burnt at the end and dipped in the blood of a goat, by a swift messenger to the next hamlet, saying nothing but the place of rendezvous. The *Cran-tara*, which was well understood to signify destruction by fire and sword to all who did not obey the summons, passed with rapidity from village to village until all the warriors had gathered round their prince or leader and were at his command. On friendly visits the chiefs and their followers carried their spears inverted, with the points behind them, thus indicating a peaceful intention. An invading army drew the blood from the first animal they met in the enemy's domain and sprinkled it upon their ensigns,\* and before a

\* Cf. Martin, "Western Islands," p. 103.

battle the chiefs passed the night alone, meditating the dispositions of their forces in the impending action. Monuments were erected to commemorate victories, usually one large stone. Many are still remaining in different parts of Britain, which, however, now afford by their existence only the bare indication of a scene of battle the memory of which has perished in remote ages.

The funeral rites of the Britons in the south were similar to those of their neighbours the Gauls, but probably varied throughout the country with

**Funerals.**

its different occupiers and their national predilections. Briefly described by Cæsar, "the funerals of the Gauls, considering their circumstances, were sumptuous and magnificent. It was their custom to throw into the funeral pile on which the body was burnt those things and even those animals in which the deceased had most delighted; nay, some years ago they threw into the flaming pile such of his servants and friends as had been his greatest favourites, and all were reduced to ashes in the same fire." Pomponius Mela gives the same account of the funeral rites of the ancient Gauls, with the additional circumstances that, when they burnt the bodies of their dead, and buried their ashes, they buried likewise with them their books of accounts and the notes of hand for the sums of money which they had lent whilst alive, that they might exact the payment of them in the other world, and that sometimes also their near relations and friends have "flung themselves into the funeral pile expecting to live with them in a future state."\* That these burnings of the dead prevailed is undoubted from the great number of cinerary urns, evidently of British workmanship, that have been found in the barrows. Often the arms of the dead were burnt at the same time as the body; the ashes of these were collected and disposed of in similar urns. A description of the entombment of the remains of the dead who by national custom were not burnt is referred to in the Ossianic poems, and applies certainly to the Caledonians or Britons of the north. "They opened a grave six or eight feet deep, the bottom was lined with fire-clay, and on this they laid the body of the deceased, and, if a warrior, the heads of twelve arrows by his side; above

\* Mela III., c. 2, 19.

they laid another stratum of clay, in which they placed the horn of a deer, the symbol of hunting. The whole was covered with a fine mould, and four stones placed on end to mark the extent of the grave." There are many allusions in the poems of Ossian to this manner of burying the dead, from which we learn these further particulars: that the bows of warriors, as well as their swords and arrows, were deposited in their graves; that these graves were marked sometimes with only one stone, though sometimes with two; that sometimes a cairn or barrow was raised over them. The favourite dogs of the deceased were often buried near them. But the most important rite of sepulture among the Ancient Britons was the funeral song containing the praises of the deceased, sung by a number of bards to the music of their harps when the body was deposited in the grave. To want a funeral song was esteemed the greatest misfortune and disgrace, as they believed that without it their spirits could enjoy neither rest nor happiness in the world to come.

Hospitality and kindness to strangers was one of the shining virtues of the Ancient Britons, and of all the other Celtic nations. As soon as they beheld the face of a guest, haughtiness and ferocity were laid aside, and they felt—as they expressed—the sincerest joy at his arrival, accosting him with the most friendly greetings, and giving him the warmest invitations to enter their doors, which flew open for his reception. It was even long esteemed infamous by the Ancient Britons for a chieftain to shut the door of his house at all, lest (as the bards expressed it) "the strangers should come and behold his contracted soul." As soon as the stranger accepted the friendly invitation and entered the hospitable door, water was presented to him to wash his feet, and if he received and used it, and at the same time delivered his arms to the master of the house, it was understood as an intimation that he designed to favour him with his company for some time—at least one night. This diffused joy over the whole mansion; the music of the harps arose, and an entertainment was immediately prepared as sumptuous and abundant as the entertainer could afford. After this was finished the host might, without any breach of the laws of hospitality, enter into familiar conversation with his guest, and ask his name and such questions as whence he came and whither he was going.

As long as the stranger stayed his person was esteemed sacred and inviolable, the period was devoted to festivity, and every amusement in the power of the host was procured for the guest, to make his time pass the more agreeably and prolong his stay. Before his departure it was usual for the stranger to exchange a sword, spear, or piece of armour with his hospitable host, and these they both preserved with religious care as marks of mutual friendship and the rights of hospitality established between them and their families and posterity. This virtue of hospitality continued to be practised long after this period by the genuine descendants of the Ancient Britons in Wales and the Highlands of Scotland; nor is it quite banished from some of the most unfrequented parts of these countries, where it is most necessary even to this day. In connection with the custom of the open door it is worthy of remark, as coming within our personal experience, that in some places in the midland counties within the last few years the closing of a front door looking on to a high road occasioned serious popular resentment.

The Ancient Britons and other Celtic nations were famous for the warmth of their natural affections, their dutiful behaviour to their parents and superiors, and their inviolable attachment to their friends and family. All the young men of a clan or family treated the old men with the respect and duty due to parents, and those of the same age behaved towards one another as brethren. Nothing could equal the respect, affection, and lasting attachment which every family bore to its head or chief. For his safety and honour every one of his friends and followers was always ready to expose his own life to the most imminent dangers. All the members of a clan or family were animated as it were with one spirit, and whoever did an injury or offered an affront to one of them drew upon himself the resentment of the whole. These virtues were, of course, liable to be carried to excess, and in a warlike people slight occasion would often lead to reckless and terrible bloodshed, followed, of course, by reprisals often exceeding their cause in horror. The justice of a quarrel, we can conceive with such a people, could, as a rule, only be satisfactorily arrived at by the sword's point. Another vice arising out of the warlike spirit, stimulated by hardship and scarcity of the necessities of life, was robbery, to which these wild tribes were much addicted.

Indeed, it may be said that their ideas were altogether destructive to the security of property, nor was it looked upon as criminal or disgraceful in any degree to help themselves at the expense of a neighbouring clan by the simple law of the stronger. Sloth also went hand in hand with such characteristics as these; it was far easier to take than to make or cultivate, and strength and immunity from physical inconvenience easily begat a spirit of pride and false honour which, after the skirmish and the cattle raid, could not condescend to household affairs, much less to the labour of agriculture. For this reason we find that the growing of corn in Cæsar's time was chiefly confined to the dwellers near the coast, and that the people of the interior lived on their cattle production, by hunting, and on the fruits of the earth as they might happen to grow and come in their way, either in the wild wastes or by plundering the fields cultivated by those whose labour, however, they despised. Under such conditions as these labour of all kinds was neglected, and none of the useful arts of peace could thrive.

Excessive indulgence in intoxicating liquors was, the classic writers tell us, a vice of the Celtic nations, and there is much evidence to show that the Britons were not an exception: the Caledonians seem to have greatly delighted in strong exhilarating drink. The truth is that mankind in all ages has been addicted—especially in cold climates—to intoxicating liquors, and the very difficulty of getting them at an early period of civilisation added a zest to their enjoyment. It is difficult to say, however, that either habits of drinking or indolence were as habitual in Britain as in some other Celtic nations: it would seem that the Britons were far less indolent than many other peoples—notably the Germans—for the Britons always took delight in athletic exercises, and even the greatest heroes assisted in the preparations of their feasts, if we may apply to a kindred nation the evidence of the Ossianic poems. No great art appears to have been employed in the cooking and the preparation of food. Tacitus tells us that some of the Celtic nations ground acorns and other wild berries, making them into a kind of bread, but it appears doubtful if this custom was practised in Britain. The art of cheese-making was not known—at any rate, in the north, although they made butter. Venison was often cooked



in the following manner:—A pit lined with smooth stones was made, and near it stood a heap of smooth flat stones of the flint kind; the stones as well as the pit were properly heated with heather. Then they laid some venison at the bottom, and a stratum of stones above it, and thus they did alternately till the pit was full. The whole was covered over with heather to confine the steam. This was evidently a very laborious process, and needed many hands for its accomplishment. Diodorus also tells us that “Near to the place where an entertainment is to be they kindle very great fires, on which they place pots, and near them spits, with which they boil and roast large joints of flesh of different kinds.”\* The Britons, we are told, also knew of some concentrated food, the secret of which is lost; by taking so much only, as of the size of a bean, the spirits were supported, and they did not suffer from hunger or thirst.

In the matter of clothing it must be borne in mind that this was as much a gradual development as any of the other arts, so that when we speak of the dress of the ancient Britons we must be careful about period and race. No doubt, from what we hear of them from ancient writers, there was a time when the inhabitants of these islands wore little, or nothing at all. We know that—especially in the north—they frequently, when engaged in battle, went entirely naked. Their simple lives and hardihood made them capable of resisting extremes of temperature under such conditions that now seem scarcely possible, although we find the Scottish Highlander of to-day can go practically bare-limbed without much inconvenience. The earliest form of manufactured clothing was the sagum or plaid—a square of cloth fastened with a thorn, which did duty for a brooch. But these mantles were only used by persons of rank and wealth; the poorer sort wore only such skins of animals as they could obtain. The plaids or mantles, when first introduced, were considered a great luxury. It is curious that they were made of one colour only, and imitated

\* The Britons had game and poultry of many kinds, but were restrained by superstition [totemism?] from using either hares, hens, or geese as food. They were acquainted with a method of salting and preserving flesh. Evaporating salt water by hot charcoal was the process of obtaining the salt, which was naturally dark in colour, but probably more valuable as a preservative from the charcoal present in it.



the skins they superseded, being smooth on one side, and having rough hair on the other. The day clothing served also for the night, and until a very much later period the people continued to sleep on the skins of animals as their principal bed-furniture.

Though the Britons and other Celtic tribes were, even in Cæsar's time and later, comparatively meanly clad, yet it was from no affectation of simplicity or contempt for ornament; on the contrary (and we may safely deduce their habits from their neighbours, the Gauls), we have it on the authority of the classical writers that while the Germans and other nations were only clad in skins, they adorned their mantles with patches of different kinds of skins and of various colours. The Gauls, besides, were rich in gold ornaments, and Polybius (I. 3) tells us that "there were very few soldiers to be seen in the foremost ranks of their armies who had not their necks and arms adorned with gold chains and bracelets." All the Celtic nations were extremely proud of the length and beauty of their hair. Some of them carried their fondness for, and admiration of, their hair to the height of extravagance. It is said to have been the last and most earnest request of a young warrior taken prisoner and condemned to be beheaded, that his hair, which was remarkably long and beautiful, might not be stained with his blood. The poems of Ossian abound with descriptions of handsome men and beautiful women. Their hair is generally described as contributing largely to their personal attractions. They used hair-washes and cosmetics—one of which is described as composed of lime, the ashes of certain vegetables, and tallow, to change or brighten the colour; and, indeed, the recorded practice of many like artifices attests the early prevalence of that desire for self-adornment which seems to be among the primitive instincts of the human race.

#### AUTHORITIES:

*Celtic Britain.*—Cæsar, *De Bello Gallico*; Tacitus, *Agricola* and *Histories*; Rhys, *Celtic Britain*. More elaborate works are:—Rhys, *Celtic Heathendom* (Hibbert Lectures) and *Arthur*; Skene's *Four Ancient Books of Wales*; Elton, *Origins of English History*; Evans, *British Coins*; Gomme, *Village Community*; Seebohm, *English Village Community*; Isaac Taylor, *Origin of the Aryans*.

*Roman Britain.*—The evidence from inscriptions is best studied in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Vol. VII., which also contains a serviceable map and a full account of the older English and Scotch books on the subject. The literary evidence

is well put together in Marquardt's *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, Vol. I. Scarth's *Roman Britain* is a useful, but rather inaccurate, popular sketch. The history of the Conquest and some estimate of the depth of Roman civilisation in the island may be found in Merivale's *History of the Romans under the Empire*, and in Mommsen's *Roman Provinces*.

## SPECIAL SUBJECTS.

*Religion ; Celtic Heathenism.*—The Druids are dealt with by Cæsar, *Bell. Gall.*, V. 12—14, VI. 11—20 ; Tacitus, *Agricola* ; and Pomponius Mela. The Welsh reader will find a mass of information, undigested, in *Hanes y Bylaniaid ar Cymry*, I. *Celtic Heathendom*, Rhys, for scholars.

*British and Roman Christianity.*—Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, I. 1—234, gives the materials. The Laws of Hywel Dda may be seen in Welsh in *Myfyrian Archæology*. Romilly Allan's *Monumental History of the British Church*, chaps. i., ii. Pryce's *Ancient British Church*. Bright's *Early English Church History*. A short summary in Welsh, by R. Williams, *Hanes yr Eglwys yr Ughymru*, c. i.

*Military Matters.*—T. Wright, *The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon*, gives a good though brief account of the successive occupations. General Roy's *Military Antiquities of the Romans in Britain* and Colt Hoare's *History of Wiltshire* may also be mentioned. For bronze and stone implements of warfare, see the works by Lyell, Lubbock, Evans, Boyd Dawkins, etc. On the organisation of the Roman army, see W. Rüstow, *Heerwesen und Kriegführung C. J. Cæsar's*, Gotha, 1855 ; and Marquardt's *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, II.

*Architecture.*—The leading and most accessible authorities are:—**PRE-ROMAN PERIOD**: Greenwell's *British Barrows* ; Boyd Dawkins, *Early Man in Britain* ; Elton, *Origins of English History* (where the classical authorities are referred to). **ROMANO-BRITISH PERIOD**: Scarth, *Roman Britain* ; Lysons, *Reliquia Britanniae Romanae* ; Wright, King, Lysons, Coote *passim*, and *Journal of the Archæological Association* (for coins) ; A. J. Evans, *Coins of Ancient Britons*, with supplement ; Stevens' *Roman Coins* ; Akerman's *Numismatic Manual*.

## CHAPTER II.

THE DECLINE OF THE ROMAN POWER. A.D. 287—450.

BRITAIN UNDER ENGLISH AND DANES. A.D. 450—1066.

WHEN the Roman Imperial system fell weak, and the farthest possession of Rome began to feel the power of the central bureaucracy a little less, Britain, which had greatly increased in riches and in tillage, in health and accessibility, became for a time the starting-point and stronghold of a succession of notable generals and administrators, who trusted in their fleet and legions and island position to enable them to bargain with the Continental holders of the purple for a share of their rank and power. For this purpose Carausius, the first and most famous of these "island emperors," is reported to have made terms with the barbarians that threatened the coasts of Gaul and Britain. He himself came from the Menapii, a Teutonic tribe dwelling by the Scheldt.\* He held his own for seven years, won acknowledgment from Maximian by hard fighting, and finally fell by the treachery of his own admiral, Allectus, A.D. 294. For two years the latter ruled the island, the bulk of his forces being Franks, who had gladly entered their kinsman's service, and maintained their own garb and fashion. A sudden invasion of Constantius's troops, creeping in a fog past Allectus's galleys lying off the Wight (as Harold's did long after), a landing to the west of the Southampton Water, and two victories—one in the south, one in London—destroyed the Frankish hosts and saved London from the horrors of a sack. Constantius the conqueror dwelt chiefly in the land he had won, and died at York. After a successful war against the

\* There were also Menapii on the East Irish coast, probably a branch of the same stock.

Caledonians, his son, Constantine the Great, took the purple, depending greatly on his father's ally, Crocus, the king of the Alamans, who desired his election. According to Diocletian's scheme of Imperial administration, the Vicar at York and the Comes Britanniarum ruled State and Army under the Præfectus Galliarum at Treves; but under the Comes there were the *Dux Britanniarum*, the former of whom took charge of the west against the Irish and Attacitti, while the latter and the *Comes Littoris Saxonici* held the line of the east coast from the Wash to Pevensey and Boulogne against the Teutonic pirates, who had already in the third century begun to infest the North Sea and Channel coasts.

The Franks and Alamans were as ready to ravage as to protect Britain, and our island might have become *France* or *Almaine* instead of *England* had not the emperors found constant and well-paid employment for every volunteer that the Frankish tribes could furnish. The rapid spread and sudden Imperial acceptance of Christianity probably led to a more vigorous policy against the heathen marauders from east and west. In 360 the western foes, Scots and Picts, were repulsed. In 367 the Count of the Saxon Shore and the Duke of the Britains fell before their foes. From west and east and north at once the island was invaded, with cruel forays and plunderings, burnings, and slave-raids. It needed all the skill of Theodosius, with two legions and many German auxiliaries, to clear the unhappy diocese of its persistent invaders. When he was recalled, King Fraomarius (a Teutonic ally) and his host were sent by Valentinian, the emperor, to guard the islands. The policy of fighting the barbarians by barbarians was not only accepted, but for a

long while successful. It was the fear that the Emperor Gratian would reward his allies, the Alans, with a settlement in Britain, that led to the choice of Clemens Maximus (a general proven against Picts and Scots) as emperor by his soldiers in 383. He slew Gratian, and took his seat of rule at Treves, at the head of the army of Britain, the pick of the natives who had now recruited the Roman garrison for years. They followed him in his southern march into Italy, and fought for him till he fell by the Save. Afterwards they came north again, though not to their own land: they settled in Armorica, to guard Gaul from the Irish

**The Barbarian  
Enemies of Britain.**

sea-rovers. Again in 396 and 400 the island was overrun by Scots and Saxons (the Franks were then busy in Gaul), till Honorius's lieutenant, the saviour of the Empire, Stilicho, came with his legions and succoured the Romans. But Rome could do no more for her remote citizens, for the Vandals, Sueves, and Alans burst into Gaul, cut off the island from Rome, and even threatened invasion. The isolated Roman troops in Britain chose for themselves, from among themselves and their allies, emperor after emperor. Marcus (possibly an Irish king) and Gratian (a Briton) successively met violent deaths; but a third, Constantius, crossed the Channel, swept back the Teutonic tribes, and won back Gaul and Spain with his troops from Britain (a fresh drain upon the fighting stock of the island). His exploits and power compelled acknowledgment of his colleagueship from Honorius. However, a rival British usurper, Gerontius, dared to call upon the defeated barbarians to attack Britain, as she now lay open to a hostile fleet and stripped of her troops. They came, but the *Civitates* of Britain (by which seem to be meant the Municipalities, with the Romanised districts about them) raised troops, foiled their foes, and casting out the useless Roman officials—who could tax them but not defend them—resolved to carry on their own government. Honorius was content, since he could not help himself, and even wrote in answer bidding the “cities” look to their own defence henceforth. And so in 410, with a final Imperial gift to the regular troops yet remaining in the lost diocese, the tie was broken that had bound Britain to Rome for more than three centuries. The rival usurpers in Gaul, who might have set up an island empire for a while, perished by each other's hands.

Christian independent Britain was now ruled by tribal kings (for the tribes had survived the Romanisation of the island), and one of the tribal kings at least claimed a kind of supremacy, and clung to the official ornaments and titles of the Count of the Britains. But these kings' selfishness and unrestrained passions, and their subjects' inter-tribal feuds and bitter disputes on religious points, weakened the independent island. Picts poured south over the Wall, and even settled within the diocese; Scots broke in on the west by Solway, Dee, Severn, and Wight; Saxons infested the

**Britain Independent, conquered by the Saxons.**

450]

whole east and south coasts. Save in the Church, public spirit seemed lost in dismay. When the Gallic bishops Germanus and Lupus came on a peaceful mission to heal dissension, discomfit heresy, and strengthen the Church, they used the arm of the flesh against a heathen host that threatened their flocks in the Dee valley in 429. But this, the far-famed *Halleluia victory*, could not be final, though it was deemed miraculous. The harassed Christians were driven, though in vain, to appeal to the famous Roman general Aetius. Something had to be done, or the island was lost, and Vortigern, the chief king, took counsel, and resolved to follow the Roman policy, and call in one band of barbarians against the rest. A band of Geotas (Jutes), with their renowned leaders Hengist and Horsa, entered the British king's service, and overthrew his enemies, the Picts and Scots, wherever they fought. More of these "Saxons" were engaged, and the experiment was successful; but soon trouble came. The mercenaries claimed higher monthly pay, and turned their arms against their employers. Dissension and treason crippled the Britons, and fire and sword swept the country. Both British and English writers have left descriptions of the great cities stormed and fired and left desolate, the fallen towers, the desecrated altars, the broken walls, the unburied bodies left to the wild beasts and birds. Of those that escaped the assault, many were pursued and killed in the hills, many forced to yield themselves as slaves, many fled over sea to their kinsmen in West Gaul, many took refuge in the wild mountains, forests, and rocks of the sea. Exact dates and details we have not. But we are told how the Kentish Britons fled to London in 457 after a battle at Crayford, and how in 473, after Hengist won a battle and took booty beyond count, "the Welsh fled from the English as from fire." In the last half of the fifth century many parts of the east and south coasts were settled by Englas, Saxons, Frisians and Geotas [Jutes].

At the end of the fifth century there was a notable rally of the Romanised Britons, under Ambrosius Aurelianus—a modest man "whose kinsfolk had for their merit been adorned with the purple," and whose descendants after his death kept up the war upon "the cruel conquerors." It was at this time that

Second Stage of  
the Conquest.

the British resistance was most stubborn, and after various victories and defeats "forty-four years and one month after the landing of the Saxons" came the year of the siege of Mons Badonicus, a great British victory, which for a time put a stop to Teutonic advance, and led to an unexpected "reviving of the island" or great part of it, though the cities that had been ravaged still lay desolate—for civil troubles, as so often, prevented Celtic union. Gildas, in the spirit of a Hebrew prophet and in his words, denounces the tyrannous king and evil priests. He mentions Constantine of the Damnonii, a perjurer and an assassin; Aurelius Conanus, whose kinsmen and brethren were cut off in youth; Vortipore, the ruler of the Demetians (men of South Wales); Cuneglas, who had raised civil war; Maglocune, the "dragon of the island," greater, but not better, than the other ruler who had fought against the king, his uncle, and who preferred poets' pæans and satires to "God's lauds sung by Christ's soldiers," who had slain his own wife and his brother's son, in order to wed the murdered man's widow. And these "five wanton steeds, mad followers of Pharaoh," he warns of wrath to come.

The sorrowing patriot sums up: "Disobedience and subjection [the Roman conquest]. Rebellion, second subjection, and slavery [the reconquest after Boadicea's rebellion]. Christianity, persecution, holy martyrs, divers heresies [the spread of the new faith, Diocletian's nine years' suppression, martyrdom of St. Alban of Verulam and SS. Aaron and Julius of Caerleon, the Arian doctrine]. Tyrants, two hostile and ravaging nations [the usurpation of Clemens Maximus and the incursions of Picts and Scots]. First devastation and defence [Theodosius's aid]. Second devastation and vengeance [Stilicho's help]. Third devastation and famine, the letters to Aetius [in the first half of the fifth century]. Victory and crimes, rumour, and the famous pestilence [the victory of the cities, civil quarrels, the panic report that this island was to be conquered, the pestilence of 445]. Her counsels, her newest enemy far crueller than the former ones, the subversion of her cities [the plan of calling in Saxon against Pict and Scot, the quarrel with the new allies, their seizing of the coasts and destruction of many walled towns]. The remnant that escaped, and finally the peace [the rallying of the Romanised British of the better sort under Ambrosius,



and the peace that followed the victory at Mons Badonicus].” Such is the text upon which the historian of this period is left to comment.

It is to the period at the end of the fifth century, a period of comparative peace, within restricted bounds, from outward foes and attempts at organisation, thwarted by family quarrels and reckless pride and crime, that the legends of Arthur refer.

The newcomers had entered upon a noble inheritance, the most fertile and civilised part of Britain.

They came from a country overgrown with big timber and thick scrub down to the water's edge, with rivers for its highroads, clearings and glades for its oases, and broad heaths and thick swamps and shallow lakes varying the else unbroken stretch of woodland. The country they came to was largely cleared and drained and tilled. Here were long water meadows and fine hill pastures with herds of cattle and flocks of sheep of divers breed, here were herb-gardens and orchards and vineyards about the houses, and here were broad cornfields of many acres, producing more grain than the island could consume. The arable was neatly tilled, mostly in Roman fashion, on the three-field course, and worked with the improved tools and plant of Roman husbandry—iron-coultered plows, iron hoes and picks, and iron-shod spades. There were ironworks, mines for tin and lead, marl-pits, quarries, potteries, brick- and tile-kilns, glassworks, and fisheries. There were more than thirty walled towns, and many camps or military stations; and these were knit together by good, well-graded, stone-made roads, practicable all the year through for men, horses, and even wheeled vehicles. The rivers were bridged, or, where the ford was at all dangerous, staked or stone-bedded. Near each town was an area of tilled land; but along the roads, at intervals of a few miles, stood neat and comfortable country houses, after the Italian fashion, each with its farm and cornfields tilled by slave or serf labour. The ports and havens were safe and handy for the vessels of that day, and a constant traffic during the summer kept up the regular supply of many foreign luxuries and utilities, which were brought in exchange for British produce—grain, metal, jet, slaves, hounds, and horses. It was a golden land to the Teutonic eye.

Condition of  
Britain at the  
English Conquest.

The manner of division of the conquered country, according

to tradition, was by lot. A stretch of country would be marked out into lots according to the number of *vills* or estates (round a town there would probably be several lots), and these lots would be dealt out by hazard in some hallowed and accustomed fashion among the conquerors—the leaders of

**The English Village  
and its Life.**

the newcomers taking several shares, and a small knot of brothers or kinsmen counting as one allottee. The Roman *villa* of Calpurnius or Severianus became the *ham* or *tun* of the Billings or Wellings. The new owners put up timber houses after the fashion of the mainland, and each little group of buildings—hall, bower, byre and barn, storehouse and stacks, horse-shed and waggon-shed—that made up a gentleman's or yeoman's homestead stood in its own garth with a hedge or wall of mud or stone around it. The long timber-roofed hall, the bell-house, the big gate, and the moat about the stockade were the signs of the gentleman's house. Two or three homesteads for the English yeomen and gentlemen, and some dozen or score of rush-thatched wattled cots for their British serfs and bondsmen, housed the stock and labour that worked the land that had belonged to the deserted *villa* of a Roman landlord. The Roman *villa* buildings, if not burnt down in the raids preceding the settlement, were usually left to fall into decay or pulled down for the useful materials, though in a few cases they may have been taken over as a dwelling by some Saxon settler. The slaves and bondsmen seem to have lived and worked precisely as they had for their former masters; but the new masters were probably fonder of putting their hand and eye to their own farm-work than the Roman provincial had been.

We know from pictures in manuscripts and from notices the routine of the year's work—the four great Feasts (that of Midsummer; that of Easter in spring, when “Lenten came to town”; that of Autumn, when the harvest was home and the winter stores laid in; and that of Midwinter, Yule, and Twelfth Night). It is more difficult to say whether any particular custom connected with these feasts was of English or British or præ-British origin. The English had early borrowed the calendar, which the Romans had got from the East, and the week of seven days replaced the older and ruder unit of five days that long prevailed in Scandinavia.

The plowing and digging and sowing and wood-cutting and lambing season takes up the early part of the year; hay-making, harvesting, shearing, follow; cattle-tending and pig-feeding, hunting and hawking, killing and salting meat, and brewing, prepare for the year's close. In the dark cold weather smith and carpenter and wright do their work, and the thresher and winnower are busy with the corn. At midsummer, and in spring and autumn, the great courts and musters were held. Wars and voyages and fairs could only go on in the summer.

The allowance of arable to a freeholding was the hide (higið) or family lot—a unit of nine score acres if the Roman three-field system existed, <sup>Old English System of Agriculture.</sup> of eight score acres on the English system of two-field course. By the former, one field was fallow, one sown with winter seed, and one with spring seed (Walter of Henley, c. iii.). In the two-field course, one was fallow and one under seed. The hide needed a full team of eight oxen to till it, and was usually divided into four *yardlands* (each of which took a yoke of oxen to till it, and was the average peasant's holding), and the *yardland* into two oxgangs or into four fardels. (A fardel was often attached to a hind's cottage, and was probably hoe-tilled.) All the arable of a village lay in two or three *common fields*, divided by grass balks into *furlong* strips (40 perches by 1), four of which went to the *acre* (40 perches by 4). Such an acre would (the perch measuring 16½ feet) make 4,840 square yards, but perch and acre varied largely in different places. The plow went four "rounds," or four "rounds" and a half, to each perch, and the furrow was about eleven inches broad. The summer fallow was plowed twice or thrice. The first plowing was about three rods and a half, the second an acre, per day. These are thirteenth-century calculations; but with little variation in measure they are probably applicable to Old English agriculture. The furlong or half-acre (double furlong) strips were allotted to the various village land-holders in each field, and the strips were in many places shifted yearly by lot. The arable was usually thrown open for pasture after Lammas, when the crops had been carried. The fallow was manured and occasionally marled. There were large *common meadows* also where hay was grown, and *common pastures*, the use of which, subject

to the local rules, was common to all village householders, as were the woods belonging to the village for building-timber and the feeding of swine.

The chief crops raised were rye, oats, barley, wheat, beans, and pease. In the garden patch of the cottage or home-stead, herbs, leeks, and kale were grown, and hives kept, the honey being used for mead and for flavouring. River-fish and pond-fish, especially eels, were eaten after Christianity came in, but still not much sea-fish, save herrings and such large fish as porpoise, sturgeon, whales. Fish was boiled and eaten with a sauce of wine or vinegar and herbs. Flesh was roasted, or boiled and eaten with the broth; Roman cooking-pots and cauldrons of metal being largely imported by the Teutonic tribes along the border of the Empire and known to the English before they conquered Britain. Bread was made in round flat cakes, of various kinds of grain, ground in a hand-mill or stone quern by the women slaves. The baker was an important person in a gentleman's household. Ale of various flavours and strengths, and mead, were brewed by every great household. Great use was made also of butter-milk in summer and sweet milk in winter. Wine was brought over from Gaul, and probably made in England in a few places, but it was a rare and expensive luxury.

One may picture the average Old English village with its classes somewhat after the following table:—

<i>a</i> Gentry	{ Thegen (squire or landlord)	{ Living on his own land, but owing special duties to the king to whose <i>comitatus</i> he has belonged. <i>Of gentle blood or rank.</i>
	{ Priest (parson)	{ Living on the glebe with which thethane (his patron who appointed him) has endowed the village church; he receives and administers the tithes and other churchdues. <i>Of gentle rank.</i>
<i>b</i> Farmer	{ Yeoman or Geneat (tenant-farmer)	{ A freeman, farming his own land or farming his lord's and then working for, as well as paying rent to, the landlord.

c Peasants	Cotsetla (cottager)	{ A labourer with five acres in lieu of wages. <i>Unfree</i> .
	Gebur (copyholder)	{ A copyholder, with no stock of his own and bound to heavy task work. <i>Unfree</i> .
d Labourers	Bee-keepers, cheese-wrights, barn-keepers, swine-herds, ox herds, shepherds, beadle, woodward, hayward	{ <i>Serfs</i> , who were paid partly in food and clothes, partly in the case of the village officials, in perquisites and dues.
e Village Tradesmen	Fisher, hunter (keeper), fowler, craftsmen (smiths, carpenters, leather workers), merchant-peddler, potter, and other travelling tradesmen	{ <i>Free men</i> , who either took service or who pursued some trade or occupation. The travelling "tradesmen," of course, sometimes had their houses in the towns.

It is probable that *thegen* and *geneat* and village tradesmen, save perhaps the smith, were mostly of English blood with such mixture as intermarriage or concubinage with the British women caused; the other classes, over most of the island, were probably largely of Celtic or pre-Celtic blood.

The same kind of division of classes seems to have prevailed from as far back as we get evidence as to the condition of an English village down to the present day; of course, with slightly differing legal rights. Thus in early times the women-servants and menials about the yeoman's or gentleman's house were absolute *slaves*, and were bought and sold as cattle; while the labourers, though *serfs*, had protection in the "custom" of the place, which limited their lord's rights over them, and they lived in their little cottages and not at their masters' houses.

The German theory formerly generally accepted, that free village communities were the rule among the English, seems to have little direct evidence to support it. The English conqueror found estates cultivated by British *servi* and *liberti* and *coloni*, according to certain rules and customs for the profit of the *dominus* and *patronus* and their own living. He stepped into the Roman patron's, or even the earlier Celtic chief's, place, exacted his dues, and farmed more or less after his fashion. The *village council* to settle matters of unjust trading, the common tillage and pasturage, and things that touched all householders, he presided at—or sent his steward if he were away at a *muster* or *folk-moot*, or

if he were on service with the king for peace or war. Many villages belonged to the king, and a big *thegen* (or a *monastery* or a *bishop* in Christian times) might own many villages. In such cases the big house or *hall* was only occupied from time to time, when the king, with his guard and council, was travelling, as was his duty, through his domains, or when the lord came to exact his dues and hold his courts.

A few quotations will best show the condition of the various landed classes. The first citations are from an old law-tract of the tenth century, but describing far earlier conditions. It begins :—

“Of the gentleman or thane [*thegen*].—It is his law that he is worthy of the right of book or charter [*i.e.*, to convey or devise his land according to his charter], and that he must do these things for his land war-service, fortress help, and bridge-work. Also on many lands more land-right [rent-duty] ariseth at the king’s ban or summons, such as maintaining of a deer-fence for the king’s vill, and clothing for war, and guarding of the sea, and head-ward, and army-guard, alms-fee and church-scot, and many other divers things.

**The Landed Classes,  
Free and Unfree,  
among the Old  
English.**

“The *geneat’s* or peasant’s *right* is divers, according to the custom on the land. On some lands he must pay rent [land gavel] and a grass-hog a year, and ride and carry and take loads, work and maintain his lord, and reap and mow, hew deer-fences and keep up hedges, build and make enclosures, bring new fare to town, pay church-scot and alms-fee, keep head-ward and horse-ward, do errands far or near, whithersoever he be told.

“The *cottar’s right*, according to the custom on the land. On some he must work all Monday the year through for his lord, and three days every week in harvest; and on some lands all days throughout August, and must mow an acre of oats a day, and he shall have his sheaf, which the reeve or lord’s bailiff shall give him. He need not pay rent [land-gavel]. He ought to have five acres—more if it be the custom of the land—and it is too little if it be less, for his work is often used. He pays hearth-penny on Holy Thursday, as every freeman is bound to do, and he must ward his lord’s inland or demesne, if he be summoned so to do, making

1068]

sea-defence or king's deer-fence and such things as his measure may be, and he pays his church-scot at Martinmass.

"The *gebur's* or *small farmer's rights* are divers; in some places they are heavy, in some middling or light. On some land it is so that he must work two days week-work, whatever work he is told off to, the first of each week, the year through, and at harvest three days week-work, and at Candlemass and Easter three. If his horse is being used [for his lord's service] he need not work while his horse is out. He must pay at Michaelmas Day ten pence rent, and at Martinmass Day twenty-three pence and a bushel of barley and two hen-fowls; at Easter a young sheep or two pence, and he shall from Martinmass to Easter lie at his lord's fold as often as he is required. And from the time when men first plow up to Martinmass he must each week plow one acre, and clean the seed himself in the lord's barn; moreover, three acres of corn-work and two of grass-plowing; if he need more grass, he must plow according as he is permitted. Of his rent plowing he must plow two acres and sow it out of his own barn, and pay his hearth-penny; he must feed a hound in equal share with his fellow, and every small farmer must pay six loaves to the swain or swine-herd when he drives his herd to mast. On the same land whereon this custom holds the small farmer must be given, for stocking his land, two oxen and one cow and six sheep, and seven acres sown on his yardland. But, the first year over, he must pay all the dues that he is bound to. And he is given tools for his work and furniture for his house; and when he dies, what he leaves goes back to his lord. . . . In some lands the small farmer must pay honey-rent, on some meat-rent, on some ale-rent. . . . The land-laws are divers, as I before said, nor have we established these rights of which we have before spoken over all the people, but we are making known what the customs are where we know them. If we come to learn better ones, we will willingly cherish and hold them according to the usage of the people we are dwelling among, for—

'He must teach laws to pleasure the people  
That would not be willing to lose his renown.'

There be many different country laws; in some there is due winter-farm [provisions brought to the lord in winter], Easter-farm, and many more that I can not tell out."



The good writer also tells of *dues* paid by, and *liveries* or allowances of food and clothes paid to, the different classes of *landless workmen* on the estates (bee-keepers, swine-herds, bond-maids, hinds, cow-herds, ox-herds, shepherds, goat-herds, cheesewrights, barn-keepers—all unfree), and of the beadle, woodward, and hayward, their dues and perquisites. These latter were chosen by their fellow village householders, with the acceptance of the landlord, to take care of the village, its arable and woodlands, for the common good. They were as a rule unfree men, though in later days the pindar or pound-keeper, and the parker or keeper, and the miller (when water-mills had taken the place of hand-querns) were freemen, often come of the yeoman class.

Of the various workers free and unfree, the famous Old English Dialogue of the beginning of the eleventh century gives a vivid picture. Says the *plowman*: "I work hard; I go out at daybreak, driving the oxen to the field, and I yoke them to the plow. Be it never so stark winter I dare not linger at

**The Workman's  
Life among the  
Old English.**

home for awe of my lord; but having yoked my oxen, and fastened share and coulter, every day I must plow a full acre or more. I have a boy driving the oxen with a goad-iron, who is hoarse with cold and shouting. And I do more also. I have to fill the oxen's bins [mangers] with hay, and water them, and take out their litter. . . . Mighty hard work it is, for I am not free."

The *shepherd* says: "In the first of the morning I drive my sheep to their pasture, and stand over them, in heat and in cold, with my dogs, lest the wolves swallow them up; and I lead them back to their folds, and milk them twice a day, and their folds I move; and I make cheese and butter, and I am true to my lord."

The *ox-herd* says: "When the plowman unyokes the oxen, I lead them to pasture, and all night I stand over them, waking against thieves; and then again in the early morning I betake them, well filled and watered, to the plowman."

The *king's hunter* says: "I braid me nets, and set them in fit places, and set my hounds to follow up the wild game, till they come unsuspecting to the net and are caught therein; and I slay them in the net. . . . With swift hounds I hunt down wild game. I take harts and boars, and bucks and roes, and sometimes hares. I give the king what I take, because I

am his hunter. He clothes me well, and feeds me, and sometimes gives me a horse or an arm-ring that I may pursue my craft the more merrily."

The *fisher* (a freeman), who gets victuals and clothes and money by his craft, says: "I go on board my boat and cast my net into the river, and cast my angle and baits, and what they catch I take. I cast the unclean [fish] away, and take me the clean for meat. The citizens buy my fish. I cannot catch as many as I could sell. Eels and pike, minnows and eel-pout, trout and lampreys." Sometimes he fishes in the sea, "but seldom, for it is a great row for me to the sea." He catches there "herring and lax [salmon], porpoises and sturgeon, oysters and crabs, mussels, periwinkles, sea-cockles, plaice and fluke, and lobsters, and many of the like. . . . It is a perilous thing to catch a whale. It is pleasanter for me to go to the river with my boat than to go with many boats whale-hunting."

The *fowler* witnesses: "In many ways I trick the birds—sometimes with nets, with gins, with lime, with whistling, with a hawk, with traps." His hawks "feed themselves and me in winter, and in Lent I let them fly off to the woods; and I catch me young birds in harvest, and tame them. But many feed the tamed ones the summer over, that they may have them ready again."

Of *craftsmen* there are mentioned ironsmiths, goldsmiths, silversmiths, coppersmiths, wood-wrights, shoe-wrights, "who make out of hides and fells shoes of various kinds, leather hose and bottles, bridle-thongs and horse-trappings, flasks and hide-vats, spur-leathers and halters, purses and pouches."

The *merchant* says: "I go aboard my ship with my goods, and go over sea and sell my things, and buy precious things which are not produced in this country, and bring them hither to you. . . . pall [brocade] and silk, precious gems and gold, various raiment and dye-stuffs, wine and oil ivory and mastling (brass-stone), copper and tin, sulphur and glass, and the like. And I wish to sell them dearer here than I buy them there, that I may get some profit wherewith I may feed myself and my wife and my sons."

The early Chronicles, whether Welsh or English, do not give us much help with regard to the Settlement. The entries of the English Chronicle referring to the south coast are plainly

unhistoric, many of the names—such as Wihtgar, Stuf, Cissa, Port—being plainly fictitious ; while Cerdic, a Giwising, like later persons of the Wessex royal house, bore a Welsh name. The occupation and fortifying of Bamborough, first with hedge and then with wall, by Ida a Branding, and the ruling of Ælle an Yffing further south, seem as certainly historic—as do all the entries after 544. Other English authorities help us to eke out the Chronicle's brief records as to the names of early settlers ; and we know that the first kings of the East English, East Saxons, Mercians, Lindesmen, came of royal clans, and traced to Woden. The East English and West Saxon royal families were connected, as were the Northumbrian Yffings and the later royal house of the Hwiccas. That the Kentish house was of close kin to the royal house of the Goths its names testify. We know that the land was settled when clans were powerful, for the new villages bear *clan-names*, not *personal names*. We know that the river-mouths and lines of open country were followed by the settlers. Thus in Sussex, as Mr. Allen has pointed out, each river-gap has been separately settled by a group of Saxons. We may ascertain from the study of place-names and topographic knowledge pretty much the lines the Conquest followed. Broad extents of fen and forest often formed barriers to the new settlements, which were long kept to. Thus the East English were geographically limited by the fens, the dykes, and the rivers. The South Saxons were parted by the Weald from Kent, and by the huge forest that filled the lowland between the Downs from the Southern Island [Southry] that was the farthest outpost of the Saxons that settled on the Thames.

Place-names again help us in making out the second stage of the Conquest, when, after the British rally at Mons Badonicus and half a century of what Gildas calls "peace," the Conquest began again, the new coast colonists pushing westward up dale and river till the backbone of the western hills and the fiords of the Severn and Dee stopped the invaders. From 550, when Sarum fell, to 571, when they gained the Chilterns and the land between the Middle Thames and Upper Ouse by a battle at Bedford, and to 577, when Dyrham fight gave them the three ancient cities of Gloucester, Cirencester, and Bath, and opened the

**The Settlement :  
How Far it  
extended at First  
Stage.**

**Second Stage of  
Conquest.**

1066]

Severn valley and the Western Channel, the West Saxons swarmed out in colonies, Dorsetas, Wiltsetas, Somersetas, Magesetas, Devonsetas—their general moot-place being at Downton, as that of Kent was at Pennenden. The South English only reached the Irish Channel in 613 after the battle of Chester; for the Welsh were stronger, better organised and led, and the country more difficult. The Middle English were long before they won the midland plain, and the March (Lichfield diocese) was long their border, and Tamworth apparently one of their political centres. But the rough high ground to the north of the Ribble and beyond the Peak, and parts of the forest and fen land by which the midlands were cut off from the north, were still held by the Welsh. Devon and Cornwall kept their native dynasties. No settlement was made north of the Forth; the Fortren Britons were strong by Stirling, and to the back of them lay Pictish tribes. The Vale of Clyde and the Lake District were a strong Welsh kingdom, and behind them the sea was ravaged by bands of Irish rovers, Celts and Picts. The following table may illustrate the probable direction of the Conquest:—

I. Geotas (Jutes, from Jutland and Göteborg district).	{	E. Kent	{	
		W. Kent		
		I. of Wight		
		Meon-waras (in Hants)		
		East English		
II. Englas (from Sleswick and Holstein coasts).	{	Lindisfaras	{	Pecsetas
		Gainas		March-men
		Gyrwas (N. and S.)		Chiltern-setas
		Mid English		Hwiccas (royal house)
		N. English of Deira		Southumbrians
III. Saxons (from Lower Weser and Elbe).	{	N. English of Bernicia	{	
		East Saxons		Middle Saxons
		South Saxons		Surrey
		West Saxons (Gewissas)		Dorsetas
		Saxons of Boulogne and Bayeux		Wiltsetas
				Somersetas
				Devonsetas
				Magesetas
				Hwiccas (584)
				Hecanas „

IV. Frisians (from Lower Ems and Rhine).	}	Small colonies on the Forth and by Damfries.
--	---	---

What the English Conquest implied, how far the natives were uprooted or driven west of Long. 2°, can only be inferred from various kinds of evidence. That there is a large percentage of Celtic and probably of præ-Celtic blood to the east of this line is certain, and the facts of the English language, which is to a great extent "the tongue of one people spoken by another," may be appealed to in confirmation rather than

<p>How far British Population Survived.</p>	<p>in contradiction of this position. Women of all classes and slaves were clearly of value to the English colonists, though they might be massacred in an occasional raid; and one may infer their being spared through the second stage of the Conquest, though many of them may have been exported to the slave markets of the Continent. In the east, which was a good deal Romanised, probably it was mostly the Latin speech which the English replaced. The east coast bears every mark of being more fully Teutonic than inland Britain, though it is fair to remember that successive Teutonic migrations, Danish and Flemish, have certainly deepened the Teutonic strain. That the greater number of the upper classes of Roman or British blood were either expelled or slain is likely throughout the country; but that the land was continuously tilled in the same fashion, and chiefly by people of the same stock, from the time when the Romans came to the time of Henry VIII., now seems pretty certain. The Kentish tradition of the Conquest, drawn probably from Welsh sources, points to the invaders bringing their women with them, as they brought their cattle; and it is stated that part of the land from which the immigrants started for Britain was long left untilled and ungrazed. In later days the Northmen carried their cattle and their women from the British Isles to Ireland, and thence to Greenland and Wineland, as authentic records declare. The West Saxon family seem to have had a close connection with some Welsh family. The East English and North English kings assumed the titles of the Roman officials they replaced, and (as Dr. Rhys points out) <i>Bretwalda</i> must be taken to be an English translation of <i>Comes</i> or <i>Dux Britanniarum</i>. The prevalence of a great mass of folk-customs, feasts and</p>
---	--

observances, beliefs and traditions, that cannot be referred to Teutonic origins, is a proof of the survival of the native population and of the intermixture of races that must have resulted from this survival. Ethelward cites a statement in the Chronicle that when the Jutes took Wight they killed but few of the people there. That cities such as Anderida, Silchester, Uriconium, were fired and destroyed, and that Chester, Carlisle, and Bath lay in ruins, does not prove that all trade and commerce were destroyed by the coming of the English, though the evidence of coins seems to prove that there was less use of metal money than before, till the eighth century and the resumption of regular trade with Gaul. The disappearance of the Welsh tongue east of Long. 2° W. can easily be accounted for; it may be paralleled by the Celticising of the præ-Celtic populations of Ireland, and by the later Englishing of the Celtic population in Ireland and Scotland. In the case of Gaul the great cities, the powerful Church, and the greater mass of Roman-speaking population converted the scattered Frankish landlords to their subjectors' tongue. That there was much paganism among the poor country-folk when the English came is probable, and this will account for the few remnants of Roman Christianity found in Britain, and explain the ease with which the servile population would accommodate themselves to heathen masters, while the difference in faith seems to have been a strong hindrance to intercourse between the free heathen Teuton and the free Welsh Christian, save in exceptional cases. In examining the physical characteristics of the present mixed populations, it must be remembered that ever since the fifteenth century there has been a steady *re-migration* of Celts from Wales, Ireland, and Scotland into England, and that this migration has been greatest in and near the towns.

There is little evidence for the size of the population, much less for its composition in the fifth and sixth centuries. We learn, however, that in Sussex there were reckoned 7,000 [8,400] households, and in the Isle of Wight 1,200 [1,440] in St. Wilfrid's day (in the last half of the seventh century).

Of the law and order of Old England we have what knowledge can be gained from—

1. Custumals and laws of certain Kentish, West Saxon, and English kings.

2. Charters and legal documents from the seventh to the eleventh century, especially the epitome of William's great survey known as Domesday Book.

3. Information and allusions in the Old English Chronicle and other Old English writings, prose and verse.

The condition of things of course varied greatly during the six hundred years which we count as Old English, and the period may be divided into—

Old English Legal  
Institutions.

(a) the time of heathen conquest; (b) the time of separate tribal States, over which one of the three bigger kingdoms of the Northumbrians of York, the men of the March, and the West Saxons successively, had a kind of supremacy or hegemony; and (c) the time when the Danes had enlarged the Northumbrians' and March-men's kingdoms, and the West Saxon kings or their Danish supplanters became sole kings in England and patrons of the whole island.

In the early period the English tribe (a congeries of clans) was ruled by a *folk-king*, for one of the two *host-leaders* or *aldermen* who led the invaders' fleet took the title of *king* (being of the blood of Woden), and the "kingly helm" became hereditary in his family. His power was subordinate to the customs of his people; he could touch no freeman's heritage or life without a process at law, which gave the freeman the right of defending his cause before his fellow-freemen; he could make no law without his people's deliberate consent; he

King and  
Comitatus.

habitually acted by the advice of his *counselors* and *wise-men*, who formed his *privy council*, as it were; and he presided at the folk-moot or tribal assembly held at regular annual intervals, surrounded by the *elders* of the nation, the gentry, and his officers. He led the *levy* or *fyrð* of his tribe to war; he represented his tribe in negotiations and alliances; and it was his duty to go about his kingdom and see that justice was upheld and evil customs and oppression put down.

He kept, like all gentlemen of estate, a *comitatus*—a number of retainers, men of valour—at his hall, whom he fed, armed, horsed, and rewarded with gifts, in return for their absolute fidelity and obedience and their defence of his person. These men were classed as the *doughty* or veterans, and the *youth* or novices, and among them were frequently *exiles*, *guests*, and *hostages*, who were often men of proved valour or



1066]

young gentlemen adventurers seeking service with a famous or generous king. Beowulf and Heremod are types of these men in the old poetry.

The classic Old English story respecting the fidelity of these *gesiths* or comrades of the king is told in the Chronicle, when Cynewulf, king of the West Saxons, went with a small company to see his mistress at Merton, and was beset by a great band of his enemies under Cyneheard, and wounded to the death, and his thanes on his fall refused reparation or quarter, but fought over their lord's body till all were slain save one, a Brit-Welsh hostage. But the news spread, and Alderman Osric and the thanes of the dead king gathered in the morning swiftly, and rode to Merton, where Cyneheard still lay; and he offered them their own assessment of money and of land if they would have him as king, and told them that kinsmen of theirs were with him who would never leave him. But they declared that none of their kinsmen could be dearer to them than their lord, and that they would never follow their lord's slayer, and they offered their kinsmen to let them go safe. But the men with Cyneheard said that they would not do otherwise than those that had fallen with the king. So they fought about the gate till the avengers broke in and slew Cyneheard and all with him save one, who was Osric's godson, and he had many wounds. The reproach addressed in the lay of Beowulf to certain *gesiths* that forsook their lord is striking, and shows the penalties of such treason.

“ Now the taking of treasure	and gifts of swords to you,
And the joys of your homes	shall wholly fail
You and your kindred :	all right to your lands,
Your family bonds	must be cast away idle
From every man of you :	as soon as the princes
Shall hear from afar	of this flight of yours,
Deed beyond doom.	Death is comelier
For a gentleman	than a shameful life.”

It was the increase of this guard that made Canute and Ethelred formidable, and the enlistment of a number of the banished sea-rovers of Jom under Thurcytel the Tall was the nucleus of the force of *house-carles* that never met its match till it perished overwhelmed by numbers one dark October evening in the great battle when the last island-born king of the older England fell at the foot of his own standard.

Kings were chosen by the people at a tribal moot, and in Christian times consecrated, in heathen times lifted to the holy stone and "chaired" on a shield. The next-of-kin of full age was usually chosen, brother succeeding brother, and claimants sometimes fighting for their claims. Women could not as a rule be queens regnant, though masterful ladies, such as Ethelfleda, the Lady of London, sometimes wielded royal power.

The growth of the royal power, and the parallel development of the king's *hired* or court and its officials, kept pace with the extension of the West Saxon kingdom till it became the kingdom of the English race. At the time of the Conquest the king had a *hoard* or treasury, and a *hoarder* or treasurer, a *referendarius* or chancellor, and a number of thanes about his person, looking after his plate, his clothes, his lodging, and his horses. When to these were added the bishops, abbots, and the aldermen who had succeeded the tribal kings in the separate "folks" or "shires" under him, the king was said to hold a *Witena-gemót* [meeting of wise-men], or *Concilium Sapientium*. The deliberations of this body had great weight; all important actions, such as law-making, were done by their advice; but they could not, and did not, pretend to do without the consent of the freeholders (yeomen and gentry and burgesses) when a capital decision—such as the voting of a tax, the election of a king, the passing of a law—was in question. At first the king of the English would go round with his proposed laws to the several folk-moots, getting the separate consent of each; but in the tenth century the kings bethought them of summoning the moots of the various shires to meet them at some convenient central spot, as Oxford or London, and what this collective moot or *Mysel-gemót* agreed to need not be confirmed again, since men from every shire were present. The *Mysel-gemót* is, of course, the *Magnum Concilium* of the Normans; and is to develop into the High Courts and Parliaments of the thirteenth century, Godwine's case being anticipatory of the Good Parliament's impeachments.

At the *folk-moot* the *concilia* of Tacitus are continued. The freeholders, full citizens of the English State, meet armed, and their meeting is at once a Parliament, a muster, and a court. The place of

The Folkmoot.

1088]

meeting was on an open moor, where the terraced mound for law proclamations, and the pit and gallows for executions, marked the sacred ground. It was marked out and consecrated in the heathen days by special ceremonies to insure good luck and justice in all proceedings. At the court, before which all greater civil and criminal cases within the shire must be tried, the king sat as president, and with him a grand jury of a certain number of freeholders, sworn to do justice. The accused, if it was a criminal trial, was solemnly indicted on oath by a regular number of jurors, his peers. If he pleaded "not guilty," and had not been caught red-handed, he was allowed to try and prove his innocence, according to definite customary rules, by ordeal or oath of "law-worthy" men. If he failed, he was sentenced to the customary penalty by the king. A few offences—such as secret killing, kin-murder, arson, witchcraft, treason to lord or tribe—were *bootless*, and implied death or exile, according to the case. The rest might be atoned for by fines to the court and compensations to the injured person, or, if he had been slain, to his family. Christian men offending against Church-law also incurred heavy and varied penances from the Church, which were laid down in the *penitentials* settled at Church councils with the archbishop's authority.

Crimes of lust, of violence, and of simple greed were not uncommon, and the list of *boots* or compensations in the Old English customals are curious reading; they are of the same type as the Burgundian, Lombard, and other early Teutonic laws—extremely minute in their distinctions of wounds and injuries. This was needful, for down to the tenth century *feud* was almost completely alternative to *law*; a man could "buy off the spear or bear it" at his pleasure; and there are records of *vendette* pursued outside and even against the law, as the famous feud between the ruling Northumbrian families proves—a feud in which the sainted Waltheof himself joined. The stronger a king was, the more he strove to make an offence against a neighbour a heavy offence against himself and his peace, accompanied with a heavy fine or *wite*; and the broad domain of feud was already greatly curtailed when William and his lawyers came to rule.

Beneath the *shire-moot* were the *hundred-moots* and *hall-moots*. The *hundred-moot* which was presided over by a

lord or an elected *hundred-elder*, did for a district what the shire did for the county, and was a court of first instance, criminal and civil, with its grand jury and enforced attendance of persons from each *vill* within the hundred. It met at regular intervals—probably quarterly—and did much of the work which in the fourteenth century was taken over from it by the Sessions of Edward III.'s Justices of the Peace. The origin of the hundred would seem to lie in the military organisation, which grouped together a number of *vills* or homesteads sufficient to furnish at least a hundred and twenty full-armed citizens for war, or fully-qualified jurors for the cases of the district.

The *hall-moots* answer to the Norman *courts baron*, and were held under the presidency of the lord of the township or his deputy. There must be a quorum of freeholders to give the court validity, and the business was of course local, and comprised a variety of small civil causes and of misdemeanours for which local custom had settled proper fines and compensations. The local tenure of land and local agricultural customs and rents gave rise to much of its business. Persons not freeholders could give evidence and sue before it.

When the king was not himself present at a shire-moot, the *alderman of the shire*, a local magnate named by the king, often a descendant of the old tribal kings, presided, and was the natural leader of the shire in war and peace. The Danes called him Earl in their district of England, and the Normans translated him as Count. To watch the king's interests there was another local freeholder of the better sort chosen by his fellows, often at the king's nomination, as *scir-gerefa* or *sheriff*. He saw to the king's rights, dues, and fines, and took care of royal estates situate in his jurisdiction. He acted as the king's representative as regards finance and the execution of justice. Cities and walled towns or boroughs had *port-gerefas* of their own, and in general a *city* had something like the organisation of a shire; a *borough* that of a hundred; the several city or borough parishes being looked on as townships. There were often fellowships or guilds in the towns for the furtherance and control of trade and pleasure.

As long as the family remained strong, and the duty of giving up or paying for an offending member and avenging an

1086]

injured member was acknowledged and carried out, the place of general police was fairly if roughly filled; but as population, migration, and new ideas loosened family ties, the kings began to substitute local mutual responsibility of freeholders arranged in little groups which were neither too large to make their duties too light, nor too small to make them too heavy. This *frank-pledge* or *frith-borrow* system lasted till it was superseded by the greater administrative rigour and police of the Angevin kings.

The army of an Old English king was made up of two elements—the *gesiths* or *house-carles* of himself and his aldermen and the shire-levies. Army and Navy.

The first were excellent soldiers, but too few—armed with ashen spear; linden shield; straight, broad-bladed, double-edged, cross-hilted sword; leathern brass-rimmed helmet, and long mail-coat of metal rings. They rode to war and fought defensively in long ranks, as close to one another as the free use of over-handed spear and sword or axe allowed, or offensively in a wedge, the “boar’s head array” (a formation the invention of which, like many other of the war-customs, was ascribed to the war-god). The shire-levies formed the bulk of the army; all freeholders, men in the prime of life, yeomen and gentry, less well armed than the king’s or aldermen’s companies, yet only needing discipline to make the best of soldiers. They were, however, subject to panic, not obliged to serve out of their own shire, nor willing to stay long from home; and they were moved by local prejudice rather than by *esprit de corps*. Alfred revived an old custom of value, and by only calling out half the legal levy at a time prevented “either the practice of war or the continuance of tillage” from being interrupted. Each shire and most big towns had to furnish a regular quota of ships, manned and victualled, for the national defence; and Alfred had warships built by Frisian shipwrights, which helped to stop the Danish invasions for nearly a century. Alfred and his successors also built great stockaded mounds or stone *burgs*, which it was the duty of the neighbouring freeholders to maintain and garrison. These strongholds effectually put an end to the Danish land-forays, and formed centres for the new division of the Midlands into administrative shires not wholly conterminous with the old tribal divisions.

The moated and stockaded hall of the alderman or thane was in small the reproduction of the king's stronghold; both gave place to the Norman castle with stone tower and walled bailey. The enormous breadth of untilled, undrained, uncleared land made hunting the "mimicry of war," and the *fyrd* was called out against the wolves as against the Danes. Men could only travel armed and in companies. All the

**Towns and Routes.** commerce of the country districts was carried on at great fairs which took place at regular dates each year. The weekly market in the nearest borough or city supplied such commoner necessities as could not be made in the homestead. It was forbidden by law to buy or sell land, cattle, or slaves, save before law-worthy witnesses or in open market at a privileged place. Cattle- and horse-fairs were always seasons of festivity and merry-making—often of feud and robbery.

THE details of the fresh invasion from the east, and the re-settlement of parts of these islands in the  
**F. YORK POWELL.** ninth century, are too intricate to set out  
**The Danish** here, but their main course may be followed.  
**Invasions.**

The empire of the Franks was threatened at the end of the eighth century by armed fleets under Jutish or Danish leaders, that laid waste the Low German coast-lands, and by degrees pushed further west till the English Channel, St. George's Channel, the Bay of Biscay, and even the Spanish and Moorish coasts, were ravaged before the middle of the ninth century.

The leaders of these pirates at first sought only slaves  
**The Scandinavian** horses, and plunder, but soon they began to  
**Settlement of the** make permanent camps on headlands and  
**Ninth Century.** islands convenient as rendezvous for their ships and winter-quarters for their men. The third stage of this movement was reached when attempts were made permanently under successful leaders to occupy parts of the ravaged coast-lands as a regular colony. The era of reconnoitring incursions in England closes with the year 855, when "heathen men first on Sheppey over winter sate"—just as the era of methodical plundering ends and that of settlement begins with the year 876, when "Halfdan dealt

out the land of the Northumbrians, and they [the newcomers] were earing and tilling it."

Of the three great kingdoms of the English, those of the Northumbrian and the East English were settled by Northmen and Danes, respectively under Halfdan (Lodbroc's son from the South of Norway), and Guthrum the Old, a Danish prince. The Mercian king was driven from his throne, and the eastern half of his realm occupied by various bands of invaders, mostly Danes. But west of Thames and south the West Saxon king, Alfred, after a long and fierce struggle, held his own, and the invaders were obliged to make terms with him, and promise to take on his faith and keep peace with him, 878. The rest of the ninth century is taken up with the baffled attempts of Hæsten, a Northman, to seize the West Saxon kingdom or part of it, and with revolts of the settled Northmen of York and the Danes of East England against their West Saxon sovran. In the tenth century Alfred's son, daughter, and grandsons recover the whole land, as the intrusive dynasties die out, till after the battles of Brunbury (937) and Stanmoor (956), the West Saxon Edgar (959) ruled as emperor of all Britain and king of all the English lands. Early in the tenth century, too, the invasions in Gaul ended with the establishment of two alien principalities—the one on the Loire, the other on the land west of Seine under Hrolf, 921. Then for a time there was peace.

The first results of this great immigration were the ruin and destruction of great part of the English coasts. Nearly every big minster and town was at one time or another plundered or burnt or put to ransom. The culture of the Northumbrian kingdom suffered a deadly blow. The Church, with its civilising and cosmopolitan influences, was for a time swept out of great districts, which fell back momentarily into heathen hands. The amount of misery caused by the murders, cattle-raising, kidnapping, and cruelty incident to these pirate forays, was very great. In the north and east the English apparently fled or made terms with the invaders; in the south the Saxons were reduced to such straits that many freeholders seem to have given up their lands for bread's sake. The impoverished people had not for years sense to support their king heartily in his attempt to secure the land permanently

**Consequences of  
Scandinavian  
Settlement in  
England.**



by establishing and garrisoning strong forts of stockaded earthwork at places where the movement of alien troops could be checked ; in building, manning, and keeping up a fleet to guard the coasts ; and in making alliances with foreign prelates and princes against the heathen foe. When the settlement had taken place, the newcomers seem to have parcelled out great blocks of land among themselves, and set up townships called by their own names. In many of the towns they had stormed or forced to surrender they sat down by the side of the English as traders and merchants. At York the Archbishop, whether out of jealousy for the Church of Canterbury (so closely connected for two generations with the ruling house of Wessex) or out of practical wisdom in the desire to make the best of things for the conquered and the conquerors, allied himself with the new northern kings. Harthacnut-Godfred was the *protégé* of St. Cuthbert himself ; and Eric Bloodax, though he seems to have been one of the causes of the burning of Ripon Minster, " which St. Wilfred timbered," and though his wife was held a witch, yet seems to have been on good terms with local churchmen and to have done little for heathendom himself. In East England the Danish and northern settlers seem to have taken easily to the new creed, which enabled them to trade far more freely than before, for there had been difficulties in the way of their intercourse with Christians, with whom, as long as they were heathen, they could not eat or drink, or join in social or legal ties. The increase in trade is shown by the improvement of the Northumbrian currency (brought up to the Continental Frankish type, not hitherto adopted in the north), and in the amount of money struck in East England under Danish rule. Even in the West Saxon kingdom fresh silver had to be struck in great quantities to pay the Danes and Northmen, and the fact that they preferred coined metal to bullion shows that they meant to use their booty in trade. Such names as Abonel, which can scarcely be anything but Moorish or Jewish, and Hludovicus, Milo, Robert, Remigius, Johannes, and Stephen, which are certainly Frankish or German, point to the fact that foreign traders had found their way to employment in England as moneyers.

The law and organisation of the newcomers was very like that found in the land. Many of their terms—such as *law*,

*husting, outlaw, bylaw, hansel, riding*—drove out the older terms when the English law was finally consolidated under the Norman and Angevin kings, and have become part of our language. There was, as might have been expected, far less *unfree land-holding* in districts settled by the Danes and Northmen than is found in those parts which they did not occupy. Powerful families were founded, such as that of Siward Beornsson, whose blood, through the martyred Waltheof, flows in our present Queen's veins. There were some among the newcomers who could not tolerate a life of obedience to a powerful king, and these, during the two generations that followed the settlements in the ninth century, preferred to go forth with their booty and slaves, and their English, Scottish, or Irish wives, to lands as yet unsettled and untilled. Hence descendants of King Ciarval and St. Edmund are to be found enrolled in the Icelandic Book of Settlements, and emigrants from the British Isles peopled the Faroes and Iceland.

As to the comparative civilisation of the English and the Northmen, there is little to be said, for there cannot have been much difference. The harder climate and rougher life of the Scandinavian Peninsula, and the isolation of the habitable districts, probably preserved old ways and customs longer than in Great Britain. But the merchant voyages in the Baltic and the north; the walrus-killing, whale-fishing, and seal-hunting that had trained many of the Northmen; the discipline of the ship and the sailor-life had filled the Northmen with energy and self-help. They were indifferently traders or pirates, according to the circumstances; they had furs to sell, and wine and weapons to bring from Gaul and Germany; they furnished slaves to the southern merchants (Jews or Moors), who led them in sorrowful gangs across Gaul to the Mediterranean coasts, where they fetched good prices. The foreign arts of stone-building, of broidery (by surface-stitching in coloured yarns), and of music the English had learned, but the Northmen admired and adopted them as soon as they settled in our islands, and the charms of church-music and pictures had as much weight in attracting converts among the Scandinavians in the tenth and eleventh centuries as they had had in the fifth and sixth over the heathen English.

Character and  
Civilisation of the  
New Settlers.

In the domestic arts, save that the English had better land, and probably better customs of tillage, there was not much difference between the Christians on the east and the heathen on the west of the North Sea.

In poetry the Northmen excel their kinsfolk, and the lays that remain of the Wicking period are far superior in power and simplicity and the true epic qualities to those of the English that have survived, though there is among the North English poems a peculiar poetic melancholy, of a half-lyric and Celtic character, which has not its analogue among the Old Northern poems. Two of the most characteristic northern forms of literature—the prose epic or *saga*, and the elaborately-metred *panegyric*—were developed out of contact with the Celtic tales and poems in the British Isles, and owe their cultivation to Icelanders, in whom there was no small proportion of Irish blood.

The moral qualities most in esteem among the newcomers were those which the English had always honoured—bravery, generosity, faithfulness, devotion to friend, kin, and lord. Pity and mercy and self-restraint were Christian virtues which the English had found hard to assimilate; and it was not till they had been some time in the new country, and taken the new faith, that the Northmen put them on and tried to put away the cruelty and treachery and reckless vengeance for which they had been long famed.

Little evidence as to the survival of the Danish tongue is forthcoming; but the races continued distinct in Essex, for instance, as late as the end of the eleventh century; and the personal names of northern origin marked out the descent of their bearers for at least a century later.

The areas settled by the Northmen can be easily traced by the place-names on the English map. On the north-west coast there are the settlements each side of Solway, with the “thing-wald” or “moot-stead” north of that water, and another up in the Cumberland fells—probably others in Westmorland. These districts were settled by Northmen from Ireland and the Isle of Man, of Norwegian stock. The date of their settlement is not recorded, but it would probably be some time in the ninth century. From Ireland, too, but at a later date in the tenth century, came the invaders that settled in Wirrall and in the

**Area of the New  
Settlement.**

1088]

neighbourhood of Manchester, where their "thing-steads" still remain.

It was the sturdy resistance of Ethelfleda, the Lady of the Marchmen, to these newcomers that saved the flank of the West Saxon line of defence from being turned and kept the Severn valley out of the Dane-law.

The Dane-law proper consisted of the fifteen shires—

Middlesex	Essex	Saxon land, settled chiefly by Danes
Norfolk	Suffolk	East English land, settled chiefly by Danes
Bucks	Beds	Land of English of the March, settled chiefly by Danes, but also by Northmen
Herts	Northants	
Cambs	Hunts	
Lincoln	Leicester	
Derby	Notts and Stamford District	Land of English of the March, settled chiefly by Northmen
Yorks	part of Durham	
		North English land, settled chiefly by Northmen

Of course there were many English or Saxon districts in these shires, but they all followed the Dane-law instead of their own Saxon or Mercian or Northumbrian laws. Thus Holderness and Northumberland remained English, and great part of St. Cuthbert's patrimony. One can trace in East England, Essex, and Lincolnshire very plainly the streams of colonisation, the little groups of northern settlers' villages. A line drawn from the Ness's mouth to Rugby, from Rugby to Skipton, and from Skipton to Preston, would be the southern line of the country, where the English *hundred* division is represented by the Northmen's *wapentakes*.

Four of the new shires were grouped about four of the *Five Boroughs*, but we do not know the reason why Stamford was not, like the others, made the head-town of one of the new Alfredian shires.

That the Five Boroughs were on the way to form a kind of town-league seems likely from several passages in the Chronicle, but there is little direct information on the subject.

Bedford and Northampton are spoken of together in connection with a Danish or Norwegian earl in Bedford, one Thurcytel, in 918. But the passage is ambiguous, and a Northern earl, Thurfirth, is spoken of in 921, who may have been the Scandinavian earl in Northampton.

Two consequences followed from the settlement of the Scandinavians in England that need separate notice. First, the several Christian powers of Great Britain were driven to ally themselves together against the heathen foe of them all; and though individual kings, like Constantine, foolishly chose to join the invader for what looked like present gain, this policy was persistent generally. In Alfred's time (885) the Welsh kings and princes—Hemeid of South Wales; Howel, Brocmail, Fernmail, kings in Mid-Wales; Helised, king of Brecon, and Anarawd and his brother of North Wales, as Asser tells us—had sought his help against the heathen, and the alliance had apparently stood firm. His son ransomed Bishop Cameleac of North Wales when he was captured by the two Norwegian earls, Ohter and Hroald, in 918, though there was a war between the South Welsh and the Lady Ethelfleda in 916. In 922 "the kings of the North Welsh, Howel and Cledauc and Ieothwel, and all the North Welsh folk, sought him as lord." Two years later, at Bakewell, in Peakland, "these chose him as father and lord there, the king of Scots and all the nation of Scots, and Rægnald and Eadulf's sons, and all that abide in Northumberland, whether English or Danish or Northmen or other; and also the Strath-Clyde Welsh king and all the Strath-Clyde Welsh." In 926 Ethelstan, Edward's son, at Eamot received pledges and oaths of peace from Huwal the West Welsh king, and Constantine, king of Scots, and Uwen, king of the men of Gwent, and Ealdred Eadulfing from Bamborough. But Constantine broke the peace, and, leaguings himself with Anlaf the Northman, a famous sea-king (who has left a legend behind him of his marvellous career), marched south. Ethelstan met his foes at Brunbury, somewhere on the north-west coast of England, and defeated them "by Christ's mercy, and slew their five kings and eight earls." Edmund, Ethelstan's brother, when he had harried over all Cumberland in 945, "let it all to Malcolm, king of Scots, on the agreement that he should be his fellow-worker both on sea and land." The Scots again repeated their oaths to King Eadred, Edmund's brother and successor in 946, and in 972 at Chester to Edgar. And this patronage or suzerainty was acknowledged by Welsh and Scottish princes afterwards repeatedly down to and in the

Some Political  
Results of  
Scandinavian  
Settlements.

Conqueror's days. The old friendship and probable inter-marriages between the house of Cerdic and the royal houses of Wales no doubt made it easier for the Welsh and West Saxon kings to be friends; while the Scots would rather look for friends farther south than the Northmen's king at York or the English earl at Bamborough.

The incorporation of Northumberland with the realm of the English king seems finally to have taken place in 954, when there ceased to be a separate under-king at York. The incorporation of East England had taken place in 921, and of Danish Mercia in 942. The new settlers had a distinct policy of their own, and one can see traces of the struggle between the reforming Scandinavian party and the old West Saxon patrons and prelates over Church questions, and between the Northern and Danish earls and the great aldermen of English Mercia over political questions, for two or three generations. The jealousy between York and Canterbury had been strong enough, as we have noticed, to make Archbishop Wulfstan ally himself with the Northmen Anlaf Sihtric's son and Rægnald Guthfirth's son and with Eric Harold's son, against his "natural lord," King Edmund, and it persisted as late as William the Norman's day and later, in a less violent form.

The disputed elections in 975, like the earlier division of the realm in 955 and the later murder of 979, may be referred to the divided state of the country under the "old" and "new" parties, as they may be called; and the inefficiency of the resistance of Ethelred to the Danish attacks in the eleventh century were probably due to the same cause. The distrust the Northern earls showed of Harold, in spite of his alliance by marriage with them and his ready succour against the Norwegians, was possibly based upon the deep difference in feeling between the northern and eastern parts of England and the shires of the south and west.

The dynastic conquest, by which for thirty years kings of the Danish house ruled all England in the place of kings of the West Saxon house, must be explained partly by the large body of professional soldiers in the Danish king's employ, partly by the folly of Ethelred and the vigour of Swegen and Canute, partly by the feeling over a great part of the country that it was not much more unnatural to be ruled by a Dane than a West Saxon, provided local rights were respected. Still

it is noteworthy that it was in East England, under Alderman Brihtnoð, in 988, at Maldon, that Anlaf Tryggvisson, Swegen's ally, met with such a check, and that it was Ulfketyl the Swift, another earl of the East English, who, in 1004, all but cut off Swegen and his host on their way down to their ships after burning Thetford, "when there was great slaughter on either side. The noblest of the East English were slain there, and, if they had been in full strength, the Danes would never have got back to their ships, as they themselves said."

The sudden death of Swegen in 1014 led to the recall of

**Danish Kings of  
England in the  
Eleventh Century.**

Ethelred, on his promising to rule better. But the Mercian alderman's treason opened the way for Canute on Ethelred's death in 1016, and, in spite of the heroic efforts of Edmund Ironside in a campaign wherein nearly all the English nobles fell, a compromise was come to at Olney. Canute was made king in Northumbria, and Mercia and Edmund in East England and Wessex. Edmund's murder at the close of the year left Canute sole king. But after a long and prosperous reign, during which he had allied himself with the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury, and raised men of his own choice but of native birth to the rule as *great earls* of the four parts of his English kingdom, and kept up his guard of *house-carles* (mercenary soldiers) as a permanent security to the crown, Canute died. At the great meeting at Oxford of all the Wise Men, Leofric and the Mercians and "most all the thanes north of Thames and the men of the fleet at London" chose Harold. But Godwine and all the West Saxon nobles wanted Hardi-Canute, and got him chosen as their West Saxon king, with Godwine and Elfgifu, Hardi-Canute's mother, to act as regent for him, as he was dwelling in his Danish kingdom. But two years later, tired of waiting for him in vain, the West Saxons drove out Elfgifu, and accepted Harold as sole king. Hardi-Canute succeeded his brother, and ruled but a brief while, favouring his kinsfolk of the old West Saxon line; so that when he died, "as he stood at his drink," the way was open for his half-brother Edward, who was chosen by "the whole people, as was natural."

The rule of the Danish dynasty did probably little, save in London and a few cities, to increase the body of Scandinavians settled in England; nor did it last long enough to bring about



the unity of English law, though steps were taken in this direction. Its influence on English speech and culture is slight and difficult to observe, compared with that of the ninth-century settlement. The influence of England upon Denmark was far greater than the influence of Denmark upon England. English soldiers fought for Canute in the Baltic, English priests and bishops reorganised and revived the Danish Church. English gold paid for the *house-carles*, and by so providing a legitimate career for military adventurers helped to keep the peace in the north; English gold overthrew St. Olaf, and helped to secure everlasting fame for Canute from the poets that crowded to the court of a king who was known to be bountiful to foreigners if he was frugal toward his own servants and subjects.

THE ecclesiastical writers to whom we are indebted for the earliest accounts of our forefathers have little to tell us of the form of religion they brought with them into Britain. Bede was most painstaking in his search for records which might throw light on the progress of Christianity; whenever he has occasion to mention the heathenism it supplanted, he dismisses the subject with a few contemptuous words.

A. H. MANN.  
Anglo-Saxon  
Paganism.

Though we are thus deprived of much valuable information in regard to details, there is abundant evidence that in its main features the paganism of the Anglo-Saxon was the same as that of other branches of the Teutonic family. With but slight variations we find the days of the week named after the same deities in all Teutonic countries. These names must have been substituted for those of Roman gods by the German tribes on the frontier of the Empire (for this, apparently, was the immediate source of the week of seven days), and by them handed on to our own ancestors, who then dwelt along the shores of the Northern Sea. Another link with German and Scandinavian tradition is given us in the genealogies of the Anglo-Saxon kings. In the form in which they have reached us they are probably the work of a later age, but they doubtless embody ancient legends, for they contain the names of many gods and heroes who play a great part in the myths of the

north. It is also certain that the Saxons continued to worship the same gods long after their arrival in this island, for there are places named after them in all parts of the country, *e.g.*, Tewesley (Tiw's lea) in Surrey, Wednesbury (Woden's borough) in Staffordshire, and Wampool (Woden's pool) in Cumberland. If we may trust comparative mythology, these gods were originally personifications of the forces of Nature, especially such as exert a powerful influence over the welfare of man. The tendency of the primitive mind to ascribe natural effects to living agents led men to see in the changes of sunshine and storm the actions of beings with forms and passions like their own. As the conception of the god grew in the imagination of the people, new fancies gathered round the central idea; fresh virtues were ascribed to him; myths arose concerning his life and adventures; and the mysterious power that lurked behind Nature assumed more and more the character of an earthly hero.

In England the Church was so successful in stamping out heathenism at an early period that there are few traces of the worship or attributes of the greater gods, and even these gain a meaning only in the light of Continental legends and customs, and especially of the rich mythology of the north, preserved for us in Icelandic literature. There is some reason for thinking that Woden, the Norse Odin, was the

**The Great Gods.** favourite god of the Anglo-Saxons. The number of places named after him is exceptionally large, and he is mentioned in all the royal pedigrees. He does not appear at the head of the list; other gods and heroes are reckoned among his ancestors, and some of the names in the ascending series are really titles of Woden himself. But this confusion only tends to show how large a place he filled in the minds of his worshippers, while his low position may be accounted for by supposing that the Woden named was a new birth of the original god in a less divine form—a notion of which there are other traces in Teutonic mythology. As far back as the close of the first century Tacitus, writing of the German tribes best known to the Romans, says that they "pay especial reverence to Mercurius," and the Teutons themselves afterwards identified Woden with this god (the Greek Hermes) by assigning to him the fourth day of the week. The attributes of Woden were,

indeed, far more extensive than those of Mercury. His name is said to be derived from the root of a verb meaning to "go" or "wander" (English *wade*), and has been supposed by some to denote his all-pervading influence. In the substantive, however, the primary meaning seems to have become merged in that of "energy" and "impetuosity," so that Woden would signify "the wild, furious one." This is hardly the light in which Hermes or Mercury is presented to us in classical mythology. Yet the northern and southern gods possessed many traits in common. They were both protectors of boundaries—we find trees and stones marking divisions of land named after Woden in Anglo-Saxon charters—and in Norse mythology the invention of runes is ascribed to Odin, as that of writing and the alphabet was to Hermes. But it was probably as the arranger of battles and giver of victory that Woden was most vividly present to the minds of the fierce bands who descended on the shores of Britain. He seems, in fact, to have assumed many functions which properly belonged to other gods. Thus the real war-god was Tiw (Norse *Tyr*), whose name is preserved in Tuesday. The fifth day was named after Thunor—the Thor of whom we hear so much in Scandinavian mythology. His name is the same word as "thunder," which was believed to be the sound of his waggon rumbling over the clouds, as the thunderbolt was the hammer with which he dealt blows on the giants of the hills and the frost. The name of the weapon seems to have been afterwards transferred to the god himself, so that in England we have not only a Thursley and a Thundersfield, but also a Hammerwick and a Homer-ton. Very different in character was the peaceful Frea, the god of the sunshine and the fertilising rain. To him the boar was sacred; its figure was worn as a charm by warriors on their helmets, as we see in the poem of "Beowulf," and the customary boar's head at Christmas-time is probably a survival of superstitions connected with his worship. Of the beautiful myth of the death of Balder, the sun-god, there are no traces in Anglo-Saxon literature. In the genealogies he is called Bældæg. The names Baldersby in Yorkshire, and Balderston in Lancashire, probably date from the period of the Danish and Norwegian invasions. It is, however, believed that *Polesworth*, *Polstead*, and other

names of Saxon origin, contain the name of this deity in another form. Saturday is said to have received its name from Sætere, whose name also appears in Satterleigh and Satterthwaite; but nothing is known concerning this god, and the name may well be a corruption of the Latin "Saturn's day." Chief among the female deities was Frige, the wife of Woden, who gave her name to the sixth day; and among the others was Eostre (whence our *Easter*), probably the goddess of dawn and the returning year, to whom sacrifices were offered in April, called by the Saxons "Eostre's month." All we learn from Bede concerning the worship of these gods is that they had temples, in which images and altars were placed, and that priests were dedicated to their service. After listening to the preaching of Paulinus, Coifi, the chief priest of Eadwine, king of the Northumbrians, violated the heathen sanctuary—which, we are told, was surrounded by hedges—by hurling into it a spear, and afterwards gave orders for it to be burnt. This anecdote helps us to understand the ease with which the missionaries overthrew the belief in gods like Thunor and Woden, of whose existence thoughtful men had already begun to grow sceptical. They were the chief objects of their attack, for the signs of their worship were everywhere visible.

But there were other deities of a vaguer and more impersonal nature, who were, perhaps, more intimately associated with the inner life of the people, and whom they would instinctively call to mind in moments of difficulty and danger. Such were the dread goddesses Hel and Wyrd (Fate), who held sway over the destinies of life and death. The conception of Hel as a woman seems early to have faded away, though many features of her realm of gloom and sorrow—the abode of those who die the death of the coward, and have no share in the joys of Wælheall—reappear in Anglo-Saxon descriptions of the Christian place of punishment. The remembrance of Wyrd lingered on side by side with the doctrine that Fate is the decree of the Almighty; in "Beowulf" we find such expressions as "Wyrd pursueth us, cruel and grim in hate," and in this and other old poems there are allusions to the web of destiny woven by the goddess for every man at his birth. Other denizens of the pagan world—giants, wights,

1066]

and elves—easily found a new home in a universe which was everywhere peopled by the malignant hosts of the Evil One Grendel—the water-spirit slain by Beowulf—is represented in the Christian poem as one of the offspring of Cain, who fled in despair from the joys of his fellow-men. Of like nature were the Nicors—monsters of the sea and fens, quelled by Beowulf in fierce combat—and the fire-dragon whom he slew, though at the cost of his own life. Among the giants were Weland (the wondrous craftsman who forged the sword with which Beowulf killed Grendel) and Ægel or Eigil, who performed the feat afterwards related of Tell and other heroes. The names of these brothers survive in Aylesbury and Aylesford, and in Wayland Smith's Cave (originally Weland's Smithy) in Berkshire. Even the greater gods were not altogether forgotten. Long after their worship had ceased they were remembered as the ancestral heroes of the race, and tales of their virtues and prowess were sung in the courts of Christian kings. Thus in the opening lines of "Beowulf" we have the legend of Scyld or Scaef, the child who drifted to the shores of the Spear-Danes, and who lived to become their king, and to found the dynasty of the Scyldings. The hero Scaef or Ing was none other than the god Frea, who taught men to till the ground and to follow the arts of civilised life. But as a national life grew up under foreign influences, these old memories gradually died away. The Church gained the control of men's thoughts, and Paganism survived only in those forms in which it was thoroughly in keeping with the materialistic conceptions of mediæval Christianity. The belief in witchcraft and in the efficacy of spells and incantations was probably as widespread in the fifteenth as it had been in the fifth century. Even now, in remote parts of the country, traces are found of practices for the origin of which we must go back to the days of Woden and Thunor.

INTERESTING and important as is the history of the Church of England as a whole, the story of its foundation unquestionably possesses an exceptional charm. This is due principally to the merits of the writer who has told the tale, and a short account of his life and work will form a fitting

J. H. MAUDE.  
The English  
Church.

introduction to a sketch of the events which he has recorded. Bede was born about the year 673, on lands belonging to the twin monasteries founded by Benedict Biscop at Wearmouth and Jarrow, and from the age of seven he

**Bede.** passed almost the whole of his life in the latter monastery, where, to use his own words, he "gave his whole energies to meditating on the Scriptures, and, amid the observance of the monastic rule and the daily ministry of singing in the church, ever held it sweet either to learn or to teach or to write." He summed up in himself all the learning of his age, and transmitted it to the school which he helped to found at York, to be diffused again by Alcuin over Europe. In him, Dr. Stubbs says, "the great knowledge of the scholar was coupled with the humility and simplicity of the purest type of monasticism." In his "*Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*"—a work in which candour, charity, and far-sightedness are combined with a power of narration and a mastery over his materials quite unparalleled in that age—he has given us almost all the knowledge that we possess of the early history of the English Church. It is especially to be noticed that the actors in this history stand out from Bede's pages real living men and women, and around the life and work of three of them—Augustine, Aidan, and Theodore—the events which issued in the formation of the English Church group themselves.

**Augustine's Mission.** In the year 596 Gregory the Great, who among his manifold anxieties always had missionary work at heart, and who had wished to go himself to convert the English, sent Augustine, the provost of his own monastery, with about forty other monks, to take the work in hand, and the expedition reached Kent in the spring of the year 597. The country to which they came was in an exceptional condition. It was the only country that had formed part of the Roman Empire where the Teutonic invaders had extirpated Christianity. For whether the British had been exterminated or not, at least their religion had made no impression whatever on their conquerors, and in the eastern half of the island it had ceased to exist. In the western half it still held its own, but without making the slightest attempt to convert the English heathens. Perhaps Christianity had always been weak in Britain. There is good

1088]

evidence that there was an organised Church at least from the latter part of the third century onwards, but the extreme scarcity of Christian remains suggests that it had no very strong hold over the people. When the English invasions began, all communication with the rest of Europe ceased for a hundred and fifty years, and for a century the history of the British Church is a blank. Fifty years before Augustine's arrival its condition is painted in the darkest hues by Gildas, but, for all that, it gave at this time some signs of activity and seems to have exerted a good influence over the sister Church in Ireland. That island had been first converted by St. Patrick, who began his labours, according to the traditional but probably inaccurate chronology, in 432; but the work was not completed, and the task of really Christianising the country was left to what is called the Second Order of Irish Saints, whose leaders received their education in Britain. The most illustrious of these missionaries, St. Columba, founded in 563 the monastery of Hii or Iona, which diffused Christianity not only among the Scots from Ireland, who occupied the south-west corner of modern Scotland, but also among the Picts. The chief peculiarity of this Scotie Church was that it was almost exclusively monastic, forming a sort of federation of groups of monasteries, without any centralised organisation, while the bishops were in some cases abbots, and in others apparently lived in monastic subjection to a presbyter abbot, their episcopal functions being almost entirely confined to conferring orders. In common also with the British Church it still followed an older way of calculating Easter—that which was in use in the west when communication with Rome was broken off—and it had a peculiar form of tonsure. These two points produced much friction later on. There was, however, this difference between the Scotie and British Churches—that the former was full of intense devotion and missionary zeal, while the latter, coming in contact only with their hated enemies the English, was entirely isolated and self-centred.

Such were the principal characteristics of the Christianity with which the Roman mission would come in contact. A few words must be added about the condition of the English themselves. Æthelbert of Kent held, at the time of Augustine's arrival, the foremost place among the English



kings. Northumbria was rising into the position of predominance which it held until 685. Mercia was consolidating itself into a powerful kingdom, and Wessex was still engaged in pushing its way westward against the Britons. East Anglia and Essex were of less importance, and Sussex was almost entirely cut off from the rest of the country. The religion of the English does not appear to have differed originally from that of the other Germanic tribes, but at this time it had a very slight hold on the affection or superstition of the people. In the narrative of the conversion of the English a priest is only once mentioned, and then he took the lead in destroying his own temple. The only king who showed an animus against Christianity tolerated it in his own dominions—at least, towards the close of his life. Temples and idols are very rarely mentioned, and there is no trace of any such prolonged struggle against superstition as can be traced, for instance, in the legendary history of Ireland. Moreover, the English had reached a stage of progress in which they would naturally welcome contact with more highly civilised peoples, and Æthelbert had already married a Frankish princess, and had guaranteed the exercise of her religion. The soil was ready for the seed.

These circumstances explain the rapidity of Augustine's first success. Æthelbert was baptised, perhaps on the Whit Sunday after the arrival of the mission, and his subjects, though no compulsion was put upon them, followed his example in crowds. In the same year Augustine was consecrated bishop at Arles, and the conversion of Kent was an accomplished fact. This was, indeed, the one solid and permanent result of Augustine's work, and, though it is less than what has been often ascribed to him, its importance was immense. Christianity from this time forward always had a centre and a starting-point in England. This was not all, however, that the mission was intended to effect. Two other tasks lay before Augustine, and in neither was he successful. One was to enter into relations with the British Church, and, if possible, secure its co-operation; the other, to organise a hierarchy and introduce Christianity throughout the other English kingdoms. How communications were first opened with the British bishops we do not know; but some years after his arrival Augustine met them in more than one conference, and finally propounded

1066)

what seem to us not unreasonable terms—namely, that the British Church should accept the Roman method of calculating the date of Easter; should make some alteration, apparently of no great importance, in their baptismal rite; and should join in preaching the Gospel to the English. These terms were rejected, and for two hundred years the English and British Churches remained bitterly hostile to each other. Probably there were faults on both sides. Gregory and Augustine seem to have assumed as a matter of course that the British bishops would submit to their authority, and the latter could not divest themselves of that hatred of the English which a war of extermination naturally engenders. With regard to organisation, Gregory's scheme was to divide England into two provinces, with Metropolitans of equal dignity at London and York, and twelve suffragans to each. But all that Augustine was able to do towards realising this was to consecrate a bishop for Rochester in the Kentish kingdom, and one for Essex. But when Æthelbert died, Essex went back at once into heathenism, and Laurentius, Augustine's successor, was on the point of giving up the whole mission and taking refuge in Gaul. This was averted, but it was not until 625 that the mission again ventured out of the Kentish kingdom. The wise and powerful King of Northumbria, Edwin, wishing to marry the sister of the King of Kent, was only allowed to do so on condition of allowing her to bring, as her mother had done, a Christian bishop as her chaplain. After much thought, and a discussion in the Witenagemot, Edwin himself was baptised, and the bishop, Paulinus, preached and baptised under his protection throughout Northumbria and Lindsey. But in 633 the Battle of Hatfield, against Penda of Mercia and a British prince who was more cruel than the heathen themselves, ended Edwin's reign and life, and Paulinus fled with the queen to Kent, and ended his days as Bishop of Rochester. Kent was again the only Christian kingdom. At Rome it seems to have been thought that the mission had failed altogether. Just before the news of the disaster arrived, the Pope had sent letters and palls to Canterbury and York. But a year or two afterwards an independent missionary, Birinus, was consecrated in Italy and sent by the Pope to make a separate attempt at the conversion of England. Through his

preaching the king of the West Saxons was baptised, and the See of Dorchester founded. The only other kingdom that owed its conversion to Roman sources was that of East Anglia, whose king some years later, having himself become a Christian in Gaul, summoned missionaries from Canterbury to teach his people.

Meanwhile the prostration of Northumbria had not lasted long. A year after the disaster Oswald, a prince of the Bernician house, who had been an exile in "Scotia," and had there embraced Christianity, drove out the British invaders. His first care was to re-convert his people, and he naturally looked for help, not to Canterbury, but to Hii. Thence was sent Aidan, whose saintly life and character make the conversion of Northumbria one of the brightest episodes in the history of the English Church. Attended by a band of pupils, often slaves whom he had ransomed (for he spent in this way any money that might be given him), he traversed Northumbria on foot, preaching in every village, and yet never omitting to spend a considerable part of each day in study of the Scriptures and in prayer. No man ever acted more consistently on the maxim *Ora et labora*. Charity, gentleness, humility, fearlessness, and an absolute devotion to his work, are the traits that Bede especially marks in his character. And his companions and successors were men of the like unworldliness. Wherever they went the people thronged to hear them in veneration of their sanctity. Bede mournfully contrasts them with the monks and clergy of his own day. To them more than half of England owed its conversion. The two great Anglian kingdoms of Northumbria and Mercia, and the smaller kingdom of Essex, were Christianised almost entirely by missionaries from the north. Twenty years after Aidan left Hii the work was practically completed, and England was a Christian country.

But it can hardly be said that the English Church had as yet come into existence. There were really several independent Churches. There were no differences that would at the present day appear serious, and there was much friendliness; but there was no generally recognised centre, there was no united action, there was, especially in the north, very little organisation. This, indeed, was the weak point in the Scotie

Church, and its peculiarities in a modified form were reproduced in Northumbria. The Scotie missionaries were full of an intense devotion, but they cared little for the externals of worship or Church government. The work of welding together the Churches of the several kingdoms into an organic whole was reserved for Theodore. "Is primus erat," says Bede, "in archiepiscopis, cui omnis Anglorum ecclesia manus dare consentiret." Before he came, indeed, one difficulty had already been removed. The two different modes of calculating Easter had soon produced some friction in Northumbria, and in the year 664 the question was settled in favour of the Roman use by a Synod which King Oswy summoned at Whitby. The Scotie bishop, Colman, with some of his followers, retired to Hii, but most conformed, and we hear no more of the Celtic usages in the English Church, though they were not given up for more than a century by many of the Scots and Britons. But in spite of the settlement of this question the Church was in a very disorganised state. After Whitby, King Oswy selected Chad, a man of great piety, to fill Colman's place; but his son, who governed part of the country, caused his friend Wilfred, who had been the champion of the Roman party, to be also consecrated *sibi suisque*. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Deusdedit, the first Englishman who held that office, died immediately after the Synod, and there was a long delay in filling it. After some time the kings of Northumbria and Kent selected a successor to the archbishop, and sent him to Rome to be consecrated, but he died there. Then, after another delay, the Pope chose a Greek monk, Theodore, of whom little was known, but who proved to be a man not only of Theodore  
of Tarsus. learning but of remarkable force of character and power of organisation, to fill the vacant place. When he reached England a man with these gifts was sorely needed. The archbishopric had been vacant for five years. Only three bishops were left in the whole of England; of these, two were rivals for the See of York, the third had bought the See of London with money. The organisation of the Church was utterly inadequate to the task that lay before it. What Theodore effected may be summed up under five heads. First, he exercised a constant and effective superintendence over the Church throughout the whole of England. The first

thing that he did after his arrival was to go through the whole country, consecrating new bishops, arranging, organising, and bringing the whole Church into a close relation with himself. Secondly, he instituted a system of Synods. Before his arrival the Council of Whitby had been the only great gathering of the English churches, and that was altogether exceptional in its circumstances, and did not meet under the presidency of Canterbury. The Council of Hertford, which Theodore summoned in 673, was not only a great ecclesiastical event, but it possesses, Dr. Stubbs says, the highest possible constitutional importance as the first collective act of the whole English race. It was not only the birthday of the English Church, but also a most important step towards the formation of the English nation. It was Theodore's design that such a council should be held every year, and though this does not seem to have been carried into effect, the possibility of united action was secured. The third great achievement was the subdivision of the dioceses. This was a more difficult matter. The conversion of the English kingdoms in almost all cases began with the Court, and the bishop was at first the king's chaplain. Thus, as there was one king in each kingdom, there was one bishop, who took his title, not from a See, but from the people; he was Bishop of the East Anglians, or the Mercians, or the Northumbrians. And the sole ruler of the Church of an independent kingdom clearly occupied a position very different from that of one among several bishops of Northumbria or Mercia. It is not surprising that the English bishops should have strongly opposed the subdivision of their dioceses. Theodore tried to pass a canon on the subject at Hertford, but failed. Nevertheless, in spite of a lamentable collision with Wilfrid, he effected a good deal. Before his death, or shortly afterwards, Northumbria had three bishops, Mercia four, East Anglia two, Wessex two; Kent had had two since 604. That more subdivisions were not made is deplored by Bede, and it was probably a permanent loss to the Church, but it clearly was not Theodore's fault. Furthermore, although it can hardly be said that Theodore instituted the parochial system, the prevalence of this system as opposed to the exclusive monasticism of the Scotie Church was secured by his measures. And lastly, moral and religious discipline was strengthened, and

1066]

Canterbury became under Theodore's care, and through the teaching of the abbot Hadrian, who came with him from Rome, a centre of learning and a school of clergy for the whole Church. The general result of Theodore's work was to secure once for all the unity and solidarity of the Church in all the English kingdoms, and to make the adhesion of the Celtic Churches a question of time.

Thus the conversion of England was complete. The main interest of the remaining history of the English Church until the Conquest centres round the decadence caused, partly by internal and organic weakness, partly by the Danish invasions, and round the various efforts at reform which culminated in the work of Dunstan. Only a few years after the death of Theodore the monasteries had deteriorated to an extent that calls forth the most outspoken remonstrances from Bede. They had multiplied beyond all reason; many of them were purely secular; and luxury and evil living were very prevalent. Some reform, however, was effected by the Council of Clovishoch in 747, and the dominance of monasticism had at all events this good result—that it tended to break down the barriers between the kingdoms, and to unify both the Church and the nation. In this century the unity of ecclesiastical administration which Theodore had established was to some extent broken up by the gift of a pall to the Bishop of York, and later on by the establishment by Offa of a third archbishopric at Lichfield. But this last arrangement was very short-lived. Before the century closed the Danish invasions had begun. Their immediate results on the Church were in the main three. They inflicted vast material loss, especially on the great monasteries, which were so constantly pillaged and burnt that the original monastic system nearly came to an end. Secondly, they interrupted all the work of the Church to such an extent that some bishoprics ceased to exist altogether, in others the succession was interrupted, and religion and learning fell before Alfred's accession to the lowest ebb. Thirdly, the province of York was for a time almost entirely cut off from the rest of the Church.

**The Seeds of  
Decay.**

With the revival of patriotism under Alfred there came also a revival of the power and influence of the Church, and



to some extent a revival of religion and learning, earnestly fostered by the pious labours of Alfred himself and some other of the kings. But the way in which this was effected brought another evil with it. A very intimate relation to

**Church and State.** the State was always a characteristic of the Church before the Conquest. No sharp line

was drawn between the two provinces. The bishop sat with the alderman to judge secular causes, and ecclesiastical business of all kinds was transacted in the Witenagemot. Thus there was always a danger of confusing the two spheres, and at this period the Church undoubtedly became more secular. The bishops began to be statesmen, and this continued until the Conquest. Some bishops were soldiers as well, and died in battle against the Danes. Sees were held in plurality. The destruction of the great monasteries caused an increase in the importance of the secular clergy as compared with the monks, and although the English clergy did not come so near to becoming an hereditary caste as was the case in Ireland and some parts of the Continent, there are many indications that this was a real and lasting danger. When

**The Reforms of Dunstan.**

the great reformer Dunstan began his work, he had to deal first with a general decay of religion and learning, which had been only partially arrested by the exertions of Alfred. The remedies by which he tried to meet this were the promotion of intercourse with the Continent, a more intimate communication with France, Flanders, Germany, and the Apostolic See being re-established, and in connection with this a reform of the monasteries, which he sought to bring under the strict Benedictine rule, and to transform into schools of learning and devotion. The discipline of the English monasteries, as we know from Bede, had often been from the first of the laxest kind; and those of Scotie origin were not even nominally under the rule of St. Benedict. Latterly secular canons had in many cases taken the place of monks. The monastic reforms which Dunstan took in hand have overshadowed in the eyes of his biographers the rest of his work, and have given occasion to the exaggerated eulogies and attacks which have obscured his life.

The second great evil to be dealt with was the secularisation of the Church. For this less could be done. The bishops, if



1086]

they had ceased to fight, continued to perform secular functions. Dunstan himself was perhaps more of the statesman than the prelate. He seems to have made some effort to enforce the rule of the Western Church about celibacy on the secular clergy, but without much success. He is commonly said to have persecuted the married clergy, but this rests on the slenderest evidence. Enough may, however, have been done to check the tendency to make benefices hereditary. A third danger to the Church was the isolated position of the province of York, which seemed likely at one time to become an independent Church. But the policy of peaceful consolidation pursued by Edgar and Dunstan averted this, and the adhesion of the northern archbishop was further secured by his connection with the See of Worcester, which from 963 to the Conquest was usually held either in plurality with York or by a near kinsman of the archbishop.

In the early part of Ethelred's reign Dunstan gradually retired from public life, and spent his last days in peace and devotion. The next thirty <sup>The Church before the Conquest.</sup> years, to the accession of Canute, form a period marked by disaster and retrogression both in Church and State. The Church, indeed, has but little history during these years: the heroic death of the Archbishop Elphege is one of the few events which light up the gloom. The accession of Canute, however, which might have seemed an augury of the worst fate for the Church, was the beginning of a short period of peace and prosperity. "The society," says Dr. Stubbs, "which is unable to withstand the arms of Canute, almost immediately humanises and elevates him." Not only was he a great builder and restorer of churches and monasteries, but he was also an active and wise legislator for the Church as well as the State, and brought the former into a closer connection with the Continent and with Rome. And yet, though the Church was in a way prosperous, religion declined, and even when, after the savage rule of Canute's sons, the accession of Edward seemed to promise better things, abuses such as simony and pluralities went on unchecked, and a general inefficiency and indifference prevailed in the Church as in the State. Edward, no doubt, was sincere in his wish for reform, but his policy was a signal failure. By forcing foreign ecclesiastics, in season and out of season, into

the chief dignities of the Church, he only intensified the evils which he would have remedied. The foreign prelates were mistrusted and hated by the people which they despised, and the attempt to elevate the Church by contact with a higher civilisation only deprived it of any efficient government. Foreign influence was destined to prevail, and to infuse new energy into an exhausted society, but this was only effected through the great tribulation of the Conquest.

These are the main outlines of the history of the first period in the life of the English Church.

**Recapitulation.** This history supplies a record, quite unique in its detail and accuracy, of the conversion of a people altogether untouched by Roman civilisation. It further describes the process by which a number of petty communities, converted from different sources to different types of Christianity, were united in one National Church. And it shows the development of a National Church which was but little influenced, and hardly at all controlled, by the rest of Christendom. The history of the next period will show how it became an integral part of the great hierarchy of the mediæval Western Church.

WHEN we speak of a body of law, we use a metaphor so apt that it is hardly a metaphor. We picture to ourselves a being that lives and grows, that preserves its identity while every atom of which it is composed is subject to a ceaseless process of change, decay, and renewal. At any given moment of time—for example, in the present year—it may, indeed, seem to us that our legislators have, and freely exercise, an almost boundless power of doing what they will with the laws under which we live; and yet we know that, do what they may, their work will become an organic part of an already existing system.

**F. W. MAITLAND.**  
**Legal History.**

Already, if we look back at the ages which are the most famous in the history of English legislation—the age of Bentham and the radical reform, the age which appropriated the gains that had been won but not secured under the rule of Cromwell, the age of Henry VIII., the age of Edward I. (“our English Justinian”)—it must seem to us that, for all their activity, they

**Continuity of  
English Law.**

changed, and could change, but little in the great body of law which they had inherited from their predecessors. Hardly a rule remains unaltered, and yet the body of law that now lives among us is the same body that Blackstone described in the eighteenth century, Coke in the seventeenth, Littleton in the fifteenth, Bracton in the thirteenth, Glanvill in the twelfth. This continuity, this identity, is very real to us if we know that for the last seven hundred years all the judgments of the courts at Westminster have been recorded, and that for the most part they can still be read. Were the world large enough to contain such a book, we might publish not merely a biography, but a journal or diary, of English law, telling what it has done, if not day by day, at least term by term, ever since the reign of Richard I.; and eventful though its life may have been, it has had but a single life.

Beyond these seven centuries there lie six other centuries that are but partially and fitfully lit, and in one of them a great catastrophe, the Norman Conquest, befell England and the law of England. However, we never quite lose the thread of the story. Along one path or another we can trace back the footprints, which have their starting-place in some settlement of wild Germans who are invading the soil of Roman provinces, and coming in contact with the civilisation of the old world. Here the trail stops, the dim twilight becomes darkness; we pass from an age in which men seldom write their laws, to one in which they cannot write at all. Beyond lies the realm of guess-work.

About the year 600 Æthelbert, king of the Kentings, by the counsel of his wise men, caused the laws of his people to be set down in writing. He had just received the Christian faith at the hands of Roman missionaries, and it was in imitation of the Romans that he and his folk desired to have written laws. His reign overlaps the reign of Justinian, and perhaps he had heard how in the far east the Roman emperor had been legislating on a magnificent scale. English law begins to speak just when Roman law has spoken what will, in a certain sense, be its final words. On the Continent of Europe the same thing had been happening. No sooner did the barbarian tribe feel the influence of Rome than it wished for a written code of laws. Æthelbert and his Jutes in Kent are doing what

**The First  
English Code.**

the Salian Franks did a century ago when they wrote down their famous *Lex Salica*; but while on the Continent the laws of the conquering Germans are written in the Latin language of the conquered, in England the barbarians from the first write down their law in the language that they speak, the language which is to become English.

Æthelbert's laws have come down to us, though only in a copy made after the Norman Conquest. They may seem to us primitive enough. The emperor at Byzantium, could he have seen them, would assuredly have denied that they had any points in common with the Roman law-books, save that they were laws, and were in writing. Nevertheless, we cannot call them primitive in any absolute sense of that term. They are Christian.

**Christian  
Influences.**

Let us look at the first sentence, the first recorded utterance of English law:—"God's fee [property] and the church's, twelve-fold; bishop's fee, eleven-fold; priest's fee, nine-fold; deacon's fee, six-fold; clerk's fee, three-fold." Churches, bishops, priests, deacons, clerks—these are no archaic German institutions; they are Latin, they have Latin names which must be taken up bodily into the Teutonic speech of the new converts. Unfortunately (so we may now think) Germanic law has no written memorials of the days of its heathenry. Every trace, but the very faintest, of the old religion has been carefully expurgated from all that is written, for all that is written passes under ecclesiastical hands. Thus we may guess that a new force is already beginning to transfigure the whole sum and substance of barbaric law, before that law speaks the first words that we can hear. It is a wild plant that has already been torn from its native soil and set to grow in a garden. The change of faith, and the substitution of one order of religious rites for another, would in any case mean much, for we have reason to believe that the old law had in it a strong sacral element; but as it is, they mean the influence of the old civilised world upon the new barbarian world.

Æthelbert's laws consist of ninety brief sentences. Two will serve as samples:—"If one man strike another with the fist on the nose—three shillings." "If the eye be struck out let boot [*i.e.*, amends] be made with fifty shillings." To call this brief tariff a code may seem strange, but there are not wanting signs that the wise-men of Kent are committing to

1038]

writing as much of their traditional law as they can remember in the form of abstract propositions. No doubt much more law—in particular, a law of procedure—is known to them implicitly. If a concrete case were to occur, they would be ready with a doom ; but when asked for general rules, these ninety are all that they can call to mind. Thus we may say that our legal history starts with an act of codification. This code became the basis of Kentish law. Subsequent kings in the course of the seventh century, Hlothar, Eadric, Wihtræd, with the counsel of the wise, add some fifty new dooms to the written law of the men of Kent. Then the scene changes to Wessex. In the middle of the seventh century the West Saxons received Christianity ; before its end they had written laws, the laws of Ine. By the advice of his bishops and of the oldest and wisest men, Ine published a set of laws which tell us a good deal more than we can learn from the Kentish series.

*The Laws of Ine.*

The next legislator whose work has come down to us is the great Alfred. His laws are divided from those of his ancestor Ine by a period of two centuries or thereabouts. This is the one great gap in our continuous legal history. In the history of religion and learning and letters these centuries are far from being the darkest. They cover the time when Northumbria was for a while a centre of light—not for England only, but for the world at large. It may be that we have lost some things. It is fairly certain that Offa of Mercia, in the days of Mercia's greatness, issued written laws. When Alfred is king, when all England is becoming united under the vigorous princes of the West Saxon house, the three legislators whose names are still remembered are Æthelbert of Kent, Ine of Wessex, and Offa of Mercia. From the manner in which Alfred speaks of them and of their laws we may gather that, heavy though our losses may have been, we have lost no document that testified to any revolutionary change in the law. Though near three hundred years have gone by since Æthelbert's death, his dooms are still in force among the Kentish people. Alfred tells us that he dared to add but little of his own to the work of his three great forerunners ; and though we can see that during the last two centuries some new legal ideas have emerged, still the core of the law

*Alfred's  
Legislation.*

is what it was. What can be put in writing is for the more part a tariff of the sums that must be paid when deeds of violence are done.

The Alfred of sober truth is not the Alfred of legal legend—for the history of law has its legends—the inventive architect of a British Constitution; but his laws are the first member of a grand series—the capitularies, we might call them, of the English kings of the West Saxon house. Edward the Elder, Æthelstan, Edmund, and Edgar, with the counsel of their wise-men, legislate in a bold, masterful fashion. For the better maintenance of the peace, they sharpen the old rules and they make new rules. Written law accumulates somewhat rapidly; it is expected by this time that the dooms-men will be able to find in the “doom-book,” the book of written law, judgments apt for most of the cases which come before them. This series extends from the beginning to the end of the tenth century. The laws of Æthelred continue it into the eleventh century. His laws were many, for he had to say the same thing over and over again; we can see on their face that they were ineffectual. He begs and prays men to keep the peace and desist from crime; he must beg and pray, for he cannot command and punish. The Danes were ravaging and conquering; the State tottered; the house of

**Canute.**

Cerdic fell. It was left for the mighty Canute to bring to a noble close the first great period in the history of English law, the period during which laws were written in the English language, the period which it is convenient to call Anglo-Saxon. Canute's code we must, if we have regard to the age in which it was issued, call a long and a comprehensive code. It repeats, with improvements, things that have been said before; the great Dane was able to enforce as laws rules which in the mouth of his predecessor had been little better than pious wishes; but it also contained many things that had not been said before. The whole economic and political structure of society was undergoing a great change. If by any two words we could indicate the nature of this elaborate process, we might say that tribalism was giving place to feudalism. Had Canute's successors been his equals in vigour and wisdom, perhaps the change might have been consummated peacefully, and by means of written laws which we might now be reading. As it was, there came to

the throne the holy but imbecile Edward. In after-days he won not only the halo of the saint, to which he may have been entitled, but the fame, **The Laws of the Confessor.** to which he certainly was not entitled, of having been a great legislator. In the minster that he reared, king after king made oath to observe the laws of the Confessor. So far as we know, he never made a law. Had he made laws, had he even made good use of those that were already made, there might have been no Norman Conquest of England. But then had there been no Norman Conquest of England, Edward would never have gained his fictitious glories. As it was, men looked back to him as the last of the English kings of the English—for of Harold, who had become the perjured usurper, there could be no talk—and galled by the yoke of their French masters, they sighed for Saint Edward's law, meaning thereby the law that had prevailed in a yet unvanquished England.

Now these enacted and written laws of our forefathers, representing as they do some four centuries and a half, representing as long a period as **Contrast of Ancient and Modern Statutes.** that which divides us from the Wars of the Roses, will seem a small thing to the first glance of a modern eye. They might all be handsomely printed on a hundred pages such as that which is now before the reader. A session of Parliament which produced no larger mass of matter we should nowadays regard as a sterile session. In the Georgian age many more words than are contained in the whole code of Canute would have been devoted to the modest purpose of paving and lighting the borough of Little Peddlington. It is but fair to our ancient kings and their wise-men to say that when they spoke, they spoke briefly and pointedly. They had no fear that ingenious lawyers would turn their words inside out. "God's fee and the Church's, twelve-fold"—they feel that they need say no more than this about one very important matter. Also we have to remember that life was simple; men could do, men could wish to do, but few things. Our increasing mastery over the physical world is always amplifying the province of law, for it is always complicating the relationships which exist between human beings. Many a modern Act of Parliament is the product of the steam-engine, and there is no great need for a law of copyright until long after



the printing-press has begun its work. For all this, however, it is true that these old written and enacted dooms contain but a part of the law which was enforced in England.

If we say that law serves three great purposes, that it punishes crime, redresses wrong, and decides disputes—and perhaps we need not go into the matter more deeply than this—then we may go on to say that in ancient days the two first of these three purposes are indistinguishably blended, while with the third the legislator seldom troubles himself. If he can maintain the peace, suppress violence and theft, keep vengeance within moderate bounds, he is well satisfied ; he will not be at pains to enact a law of contract or of inheritance, a law of husband and wife, a law of landlord and tenant. All this can safely be left to unwritten tradition. He has no care to satisfy the curiosity of a remote posterity which will come prying into these affairs and wish to write books about them. Thus, to take one example, the courts must have been ready to decide disputes about the property of dead men ; there must have been a general law, or various tribal or local laws, of inheritance. But the law-givers tell us nothing about this. If we would recover the old rules, we must make the best that we may of stray hints and chance stories, and of those archaisms which we find embedded in the law of later days.

The laws of the folk, the “folk-right”—“law” is one of those words which the Danes bring with them—is known to the men of the folk, but more especially to the old and wise. The freemen, or the free landowners, of the hundred are in duty bound to frequent the “moot,” or court of the hundred, to declare the law and to make the dooms. The presiding ealdorman or sheriff turns to them when a statement of the law is wanted. As yet there is no class of professional lawyers, but the work of attending the courts is discharged chiefly by men of substance, men of thegnly rank ; the small folk are glad to stay at home.

Also some men acquire a great reputation for legal learning, and there was much to be learnt, though no one thought of setting it in writing. We should assuredly make a great mistake were

**Characteristics  
of Early Law.**

we to picture to ourselves these old moots as courts of equity, where “the natural man” administered an informal “law of

Nature." For one thing, as will be said elsewhere, the law of the natural man is supernatural law, a law which deals in miracles and portents. But then, again, it is exceedingly formal. It is a law of procedure. The right words must be said without slip or trip, the due ceremonial acts must be punctiliously performed, or the whole transaction will go for naught. This is the main theme of the wise-man's jurisprudence. One suspects that sometimes the man, who in the estimate of his neighbours has become very wise indeed, has it in his power to amplify tradition by devices of his own. We hear from Iceland a wonderful tale of a man so uniquely wise that though he had made himself liable to an action of a particular kind, no one could bring that action against him, for he and only he knew the appropriate words of summons: to trick him into a disclosure of this precious formula is a feat worthy of a hero. But formalism has its admirable as well as its ludicrous side. So long as law is unwritten, it must be dramatised and acted. Justice must assume a picturesque garb, or she will not be seen. And even of chicane we may say a good word, for it is the homage which lawlessness pays to law.

We have called the written laws "tariffs." They prescribe in great detail the various sums of money which must be paid by wrong-doers. There are Fine and  
Composition. payments to be made to the injured person or to the kinsfolk of the slain man; there are also payments to be made to the king, or to some other representative of the tribe or nation. The growth of this system of pecuniary mulcts gradually restricts the sphere of self-help and vengeance. The tie of blood-relationship has been the straitest of all bonds of union. If a man of one family was slain by the man of another, there would be a blood-feud, a private war. The State steps in and compels the injured family to accept the dead man's "wergild"—the dead man's price or worth, if it be duly tendered. King Edmund goes so far as to insist that the vengeance of the dead man's kinsfolk is not to comprise the guiltless members of the slayer's clan. The law's last weapon against lawlessness is outlawry. The contumacious offender is put outside the peace; he becomes the foe of all law-abiding men. It is their duty to waste his land and burn his house, to pursue him and knock him on

the head as though he were a beast of prey, for "he bears the wolf's head." As the State grows stronger, less clumsy modes of punishment become possible; the criminal can be brought to trial, and definitely sentenced to death or mutilation. We can watch a system of true punishments—corporeal and capital punishments—growing at the expense of the old system of pecuniary mulcts, blood-feud, and outlawry; but on the eve of the Norman Conquest mere homicide can still be atoned for by the payment of the dead man's price or "wergild," and if that be not paid, it is rather for the injured family than for the State to slay the slayer. Men of different ranks had different prices: the thegn was worth six ceorls, and it seems very plain that if a ceorl killed a thegn, he had to die for it, or was sold into slavery, for a thegnly wergild was quite beyond the reach of his modest means. In the twelfth century the old system perished of over-elaboration. The bill that a man-slayer ran up became in the days of feudalism too complex to be summed, too heavy to be paid; for the dead man's lord, the lord of the place where the blood was shed, and it may be many other lords, would claim fines and forfeitures. He had to pay with his eyes or with his life a debt that he could not otherwise discharge.

As yet our Germanic law had not been exposed to the assaults of Roman jurisprudence, but still it had been slowly assuming and assimilating the civilisation of the old world. This distinction we must draw. On the one hand, there has been no borrowing from the Roman legal texts. We have no proof whatever that during the five centuries which preceded the Norman Conquest any one copy of a Roman law-book existed in England. We hear faint and vague tidings of law being taught in some of the schools, but may safely believe that very little is meant thereby. The written dooms of our kings have been searched over and over again by men skilled in detecting the least shred of Roman law under the most barbaric disguise, and they have found nothing worthy of mention. That these dooms are the purest specimens of pure Germanic law has been the verdict of one scholar after another. Even the English Church, though its independence may often have been exaggerated, became very English. On the other hand, as already said, to become Christian was in a certain sense to

**The Influence of  
Rome.**

1066]

become Roman. Whether, had an impassable wall been raised round England in the last quarter of the sixth century, England would not be a barbarous country at this day—that is a question which cannot be answered. As a matter of fact, we had not to work out our own civilisation; we could adopt results already attained in the ancient world. For example, we did not invent the art of writing, we adopted it; we did not invent our alphabet, we took the Roman. And so again—to come nearer to our law—we borrowed or inherited from the old world the written legal document, the written conveyance, the will. The written conveyance was introduced along with Christianity; to all seeming Æthelbert himself began the practice of “booking” lands to the churches. We have a few genuine “land-books” from the seventh and eighth, many from the later centuries. For the more part they are written in Latin, and they were fashioned after Italian models; but at the same time we can see that those models have been barbarised and misunderstood; the English scribes pervert the neat devices of Roman lawyers. Any phrase which draws a contrast between a nation’s law and its civilisation is of course open to objection. But let us suppose that at the present day a party of English missionaries is setting forth to convert a savage tribe: perhaps no one of them would know enough of English law to carry him through the easiest examination, and yet they would take with them many ideas that are in a certain sort the ideas of English law. Without being able to define murder, they would know that in this country murderers are condemned to death; they would think that a written expression of a man’s last will should be respected, though they might well doubt whether a will is revoked by the testator’s marriage. So it was in the seventh century. From the days of Æthelbert onwards English law was under the influence of so much of Roman law as had worked itself into the tradition of the Catholic Church.

PESTILENCE on the great scale played a part in the social life of the Middle Ages which we cannot easily realise. The mediæval period may be said to begin with the great plague which arose in Lower Egypt in the reign of Justinian (A.D. 542), and spread

C. CREIGHTON.  
Public Health.

over the whole empire of the east and west. The writers of the time say that nothing checked its progress; it made havoc in cities and in the open country, ascended to the highest inhabited spots on the mountains, and penetrated to the regions of the barbarians. Along with war and famine, says Gibbon, it caused "a visible decrease of the human species, which has never been repaired in some of the fairest countries of the globe." It was the same disease as the Black Death; and, like that great invasion of the fourteenth century, the plague of the sixth century broke out time after time ("alternately languished and revived," says Gibbon), at intervals of ten or more years, being heard of in one province or another as late as the year A.D. 600. The question arises whether it came at length to Britain, which had lost its Roman civilisation, and but for its Celtic Christianity would have counted among the countries of the barbarians. Undoubtedly a great plague, called the Yellow Plague, arrived in the South of England in 664, overran the whole country, spread to Ireland, and continued at intervals until 685, if not longer. But it is probable that the seeds of the plague of Justinian's reign had been wafted to Britain at an earlier date or before the succession of plagues, from 542 onwards, is lost on the mainland of Europe. The same name of Yellow Plague is given to a pestilence which destroyed the common people of Wales "in troops," at the time when St. Sampson held the See of St. David, in the latter part of the sixth century. St. Sampson was a holy man, says the legend preserved by Giraldus, and not afraid to die; but, like so many other ecclesiastics in all time, he allowed his own spirit of self-sacrifice to be overruled by the advice of those about him, and took ship for Brittany, where he was at once made Archbishop of Dol. He carried with him to Dol the pallium of St. David, so that the Welsh See lost its archiepiscopal rank; and it is owing to that incident in ecclesiastical history that we have the fact of a great pestilence recorded. More than two generations pass before we hear again of plague in Britain and Ireland, on the trustworthy testimony of Bede. It entered English soil in 664, on the south coast, as the Black Death did long after, and, like the latter, traversed the country to Northumbria, and crossed to Ireland. It destroyed many of all ranks—of the Irish it is said two out of three died—and for

1086]

the monasteries the details are so particular down to 685 that there can be no doubt of its having been a pestilence of the greater kind, comparable to the Black Death itself, but of course in a sparser population and in a more uncivilised community. Bede himself could recall from his early recollections how it thinned the monks of Jarrow, so that his own boyish treble was all the help that the abbot had in the antiphones and responses; and he has recorded stories of its ravages in the monasteries from Selsey to Lindisfarne, as well as in Ireland, where so many of the English were then leading the monastic life. It left its mark in the traditions of Britain, and was fabled long after as the great plague of Cadwallader's time.

Historians, from Thucydides to Niebuhr, have remarked on the demoralising effects of a great pestilence such as that had been. Bede himself says that it caused the lately-converted East Saxons to relapse into heathenism; and it can hardly be doubted that the devastation of Britain by pestilence in the seventh century (and all of Europe shortly before), little as it bulks in the annals, was one chief reason why the centuries following were emphatically the Dark Ages. Those effects, such as they were, had not been produced by anything that the natives had done or left undone; the calamity was an invasion of Britain from a source which can be found at length as far away as the Delta of the Nile, just as the next great invasion of Europe by the same plague in the fourteenth century can be traced to the river-basins of China. The pestilences of native origin, which occur at longer or shorter intervals in the centuries following, were due to famines from failure of the crops and loss of cattle in bad seasons, and they took the less mortal forms of fever and flux. They thinned the population no doubt, but not more than the natural fecundity of the race would make up for in a few years; whereas the great foreign invasions of plague proper made a reduction of numbers which took centuries to replace. Of these famine-pestilences, usually accompanied or preceded by murrain of cattle, there are only a few recorded in the Anglo-Saxon period. They were, indeed, less frequent in England than abroad, and one special form of epidemic, St. Anthony's fire, or ergotism, arising from the use of rye bread (or "black bread") containing a poison, was common in France all through the Middle Ages, but is hardly

mentioned at all in the English Chronicles. One of the greatest of these pestilential periods, during which many of the chief thanes died, was the three years about 897, when King Alfred was carrying on his long but victorious struggle against the invading Danes. Some six or eight famine-pestilences are mentioned from that time to the Conquest, which were mostly connected with Danish invasions, and were caused as much by the ruthless devastation of war and by consequent neglect of agriculture as by inclement seasons. For one of the epidemics, in the year 962, the Chronicle records briefly that "the great fever was in London." In the year 1005, the Danes having been in the country for some time, such was the extremity of famine that Sweno found it prudent to take his men home to Denmark for a short space—until the next harvest doubtless. From that time to the landing of William of Normandy, the entries of famine and pestilence are more frequent than usual: it looks as if much land had gone out of cultivation, for when the Domesday survey was made by the Normans in 1086, the extent of cultivated ground was found to be, according to Hallam, "inconceivably small."

THE bands of the Angles and Saxons who, in the fifth and sixth centuries, overran and settled in Eastern Britain, were, in their military customs and organisation, much like the other Teutonic tribes who, at a somewhat earlier date, threw themselves upon the more southern provinces of the Roman Empire, there to build up the Frankish and Gothic kingdoms. But the Angles and Saxons were a stage nearer the primitive barbarism that we read of in the "Germania" of Tacitus than were their southern neighbours. The Goth and Frank had dwelt for generations along the frontier of the Roman Empire, and had learnt somewhat of the art of war while contending with the legions, and more while serving—as they habitually did—in the ranks of the Roman auxiliaries. Among the Goths especially we find the use of armour and the employment of large bodies of cavalry well established in the fifth century, while the Angles and Saxons were still a nation of foot-soldiery, and rarely provided with any defensive arms save a light shield. Living by the Elbe and the Eider, at the

C. OMAN.  
Military  
Organisation.



back of Germany, with numerous tribes placed between themselves and the Roman frontier, the Angle and Saxon had very little contact with the Empire, and preserved the ancient Teutonic habits of war almost unchanged. It was rare for them to see more of the Roman than could be gathered in a short pirate-raid to the British or Belgic coast. Unlike their brethren to the west and south, they seem very rarely to have taken service in the Roman armies.

But in the second half of the fifth century the Saxons and their kinsmen, the Angles and Jutes, began to come to Britain not merely for transient piratical excursions, but with the object of securing a permanent settlement among the harassed Celtic tribes who now disputed with each other, and with the Picts and Scots, the possession of the once prosperous province which the legions had abandoned.

It has been often disputed whether the conquest of Britain by the old English is mainly to be ascribed to tribes who emigrated wholesale, with wife and child, slave and cattle, or rather to the war-bands of mixed origin who followed the standard of the great leaders of pirate adventure. This, however, seems certain, that the second element was more prominent than the first among the conquerors of Britain. The original settlers who built up the early Saxon and Anglian kingdoms do not generally seem to have brought tribal names with them from Germany, but took their appellation from the district which they seized, calling themselves Kentings, or Deirans, or Bernicians, from the Celtic names of the districts they conquered, or South and Mid-Saxons, Middle and East Angles, according as their settlements lay in relation to each other.\* This would seem to show that they were not emigrant tribes, but new aggregations of military adventurers.

What the Saxon war-band was like we know well enough from the description of the Roman Tacitus, as well as from the archaic English epic of Beowulf. The chief who had made himself a great name in war, gathered around him a swarm of companions—*comites* as Tacitus called them, *gesiths* as the early English laws style them. To them he delivered sword and shield; they dwelt around his hearth and shared

\* Only a few tribal names seem to have existed of other than territorial origin, *e.g.*, the West Saxons were "Gewissas," the Fen-men "Gyrwas."

his feasts and drinking bouts. All had sworn to be his "men," to follow him to the field and obey his lightest word in peace and war. They had put their freedom and their future in his hands; in return he was bound to deal nobly with them, to part among them the proceeds of his conquests and forays, to deck them with rings of gold and costly raiment, and share among them the corn-lands and pastures that their swords might win him.

What were the arms and appearance of the war-band of gesiths that followed a Hengist or a Cerdic to win themselves a home on British soil, we know well enough from the tangible evidence of countless Anglo-Saxon graves, as well as from the descriptions of writers. They fought on foot, though great men used horses to ride to the battle-field. The chiefs and their more honoured followers wore shirts of chain-mail reaching down to the thighs, and iron helmets, often adorned with the figure of a boar for crest. But the majority of the host went forth in their tunics, without any defensive armour save the shield. This was a round, convex target of wood, generally of the lime-tree, strengthened in the centre with a large projecting iron boss, and protected round its edge with an iron rim. Sometimes leather was stretched across the wood for extra strength, and devices were often painted upon it.

Such were the defensive arms of the old English. Of weapons of offence, the spear seems to have been the most universal, as it had been among the Germans, whom Tacitus described four hundred years earlier. In Anglo-Saxon cemeteries it is the weapon found buried with every warrior, while the sword is by no means so universal. Barbed and triangular spear-heads are occasionally found, but the usual type has a lozenge-shaped head, which varies from ten to fifteen inches in length. The length of the whole weapon was, on the average, about six feet. The oldest English sword was straight, double-edged, and acutely pointed. It was not as yet fitted with a cross-piece or guard, the handle merely curving in for the grasp. But ere long the invaluable addition of the guard was made, and the sword assumed the ordinary cross-handled, mediæval shape. The axe was not a common weapon. When found, it is not of the large-headed, long-staved type introduced

**Weapons.**

by the Danes at a later date, but is of a light shape, resembling the ancient Frankish *francisca*, showing a tomahawk-like blade and constructed to be thrown, no less than to be used for hewing. The large two-edged dagger, of a broad leaf shape, fifteen or sixteen inches long, seems to have been the *seax* which is always associated with the name of the Saxons, but it is not so frequently found as might have been expected from its celebrity.

Among missile weapons, the javelin, of various sizes and shapes, was the favourite. The bow, though not uncommon, was never a typical nor a very effective weapon with the old English; still less was the sling employed—though it, too, was not unknown.

The war-bands of the old English *heretogas* and *ealdormen* carved out for themselves small conquests in Eastern Britain, and the *gesiths* settled down in their newly-won farmsteads, and became each the master of a number of followers who looked up to them just as they themselves looked up to their original war-lord. By the peaceful union, or by the forcible subjection, of several of these small military groups, the greater chiefs became so powerful that they abjured their old title of *ealdorman* in favour of the greater name of king. The earlier kingdoms were small, like Kent or Sussex, but the later and larger ones, such as Wessex or Northumbria, were of very considerable size and strength.

Unmolested for several centuries in their new island home, and only engaged in wars with their weaker Celtic neighbours, or with each other, the old English kept up the ancient Teutonic war-customs long after they had become modified among Continental nations. The wars of Edwin, or Offa, or Egbert were fought out by the king and his *gesiths*, backed by the hasty levies of the shires headed by their *ealdormen* and *reeves*. Hence came the spasmodic and inconsequent nature of the wars of the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries. No great organiser arose to create a new military power, and the ancient type, efficient enough in the days of the first conquest of Britain, was unsuited to the new conditions of the heptarchic monarchies. The strength of a kingdom could be mustered for a single battle or a short campaign, but there was no permanent military organisation such as was needed if one kingdom was to

thoroughly subdue and hold down another. Hence came the want of continuity in the old English history; all the victories and conquests of an Oswald or an Offa were of no avail, because the subject kingdoms—held down by no permanent garrison or standing army—kept revolting till they chanced to shake off the yoke of their neighbours, or at least became free when death removed the great warrior who had subdued them.

THE aimless strife between the old English kingdoms might have been protracted indefinitely if a new power had not intervened to bring about the union of England. This power was that of the Danish Vikings, who swooped down on the island in the ninth century, and seemed about to deal with the English much as the English had dealt with the Welsh five hundred years before. The Vikings were in a state of society almost exactly resembling that of their predecessors in the conquest of Britain, consisting of war-bands of adventurers who had elected to follow the banner of some noted leader, and expected to win plunder and land while fighting his battles. From the first moment of their arrival the Danes showed, by the fearful success of their raids, that they had obtained a complete military ascendancy over the English. The latter, now settled for centuries on the land, scattered in small communities over a large space, and taught by Christianity to abstain, to a certain extent, from the wars which had been the delight of their ancestors, had lost the constant practice in arms which once made the strength of their military organisation. Personally, the Dane was a member of an old war-band contending with a farmer fresh from the plough, a veteran soldier pitted against a raw militiaman. He was far better provided with arms than his adversaries, for the iron cap and mail-shirt seem to have been universal among the Vikings, and not exceptional, as was the case among the English. The “fyrd” of an English kingdom came out against them with only a small proportion of mailed men, backed by a half-armed crowd of rustics bearing weapons of all kinds, from spear and sword to scythe and stone-hammer.

C. OMAN.  
Danish Warfare.

With anything like equal numbers in the field the Viking was easily able to hold his own; but when the whole countryside had been raised, and the fyrd of three or four shires was swarming up against him, the invader would have been overwhelmed by the force of numbers if he had waited to be attacked in the open. Fighting, however, was not so much his end as plunder; and when the angry country folk turned out against him in overwhelming strength, the Viking took to his boats again, or saved himself by a rapid march into a new and unharried district. The fyrd arrived, as a rule, at the spot where the ravager had last been seen, to find only blazing cottages and pillaged churches, but no trace of an enemy. Ere long it became a favourite habit of the Vikings, as soon as they had landed, to lay hands on all the horses of the neighbourhood, and provide themselves with the means of rapid motion the moment they had got ashore. "There the army was a-horsed" is a frequent phrase in the Anglo-Saxon chronicle when the doings of one of the Viking hosts are being detailed. Once in the saddle, the Danish horse-marine, if so we may call him, rode away from the fyrd as long as he listed. The pursuing English toiled after him in vain, till he chose to return to his ships and take his departure. When intercepted, and driven to bay—as was sometimes the case in spite of all their skill and swiftness—the Danes habitually took to surrounding themselves with entrenchments, a custom which the English had never adopted. Girt by a ditch and palisade on some convenient hill or cape, they waited behind their defences till the fyrd had melted home again. Assaults on the Danish entrenchments were seldom successful; the local levies could seldom break through stakes and fosse manned by the heavily-armed line of axemen.

If we trace out a typical campaign of Englishman against Dane, such as Ethelred and Alfred's great struggle against the hosts of Halfdan and Bagsaeg, 871 A.D., we find that when, after winning a considerable victory in the open field, the English king thrust the invaders into their fortified camp at Reading, he was quite unable to storm it, and ended a successful campaign by a dismal failure and a retreat from before the impregnable palisades. The disasters of the last quarter of the ninth century caused the re-organisation of

the old English military system. It was obvious that something more than a hasty muster of the *fyrð* was necessary to keep away the Danes. By the hands of the great Alfred a considerable improvement in the military strength of England was accomplished. He built a fleet, which did something to dispute the complete control of the sea which the Danes had hitherto possessed, and made their easy retreats by water more dangerous. On land his work was even more notable. It was directed towards strengthening the more efficient elements in the national host, by increasing the proportion of heavily-armed warriors which it contained. This was done by taking into the strict military dependence on the king as war-lord, after the fashion of the *gesiths* of an earlier age, all the landed men of the kingdom. Every holder of five hides of land was subjected to "thegn-service," as the military dependence on the king had now grown to be called. The thegns had to follow their lord whenever he took the field, arrayed in full equipment of helm and mail-shirt, and formed the core and permanent basis of the royal army. Such were the "bands of chosen ones" at whose head Alfred, and his son Edward, faced the Danish axemen and turned the balance of war in favour of England. The great national levy of the *fyrð*, though it still retained its miscellaneous armament and comparative inefficiency, was made a more permanent military force by being divided into two halves, each of which was to take the field in turn, while the other tilled the fields. It served but as the shaft of the weapon of which the thegnhood formed the iron barb.

Thus re-organised, and led by the gallant princes of the house of Egbert, the English host asserted an equality with, and then an ascendancy over, the Viking bands. It is to be noted, however, that the invaders had sunk in military efficiency from the moment that they began to "give hostages to fortune." The predominance of the first Vikings came from the fact that they were professional soldiers devoted to war alone, and that they had no homes or treasures to defend, like their adversaries, but were always free to take the offensive. Their sons, who had acquired farms and houses in England and settled down into landholders, were neither so constantly practised in arms nor so free of responsibilities of defence. A Dane of the "Dane-Law" (*Danelagh*), when at war

1066]

with Edward or Athelstan, had to protect his own Yorkshire or Lincolnshire homestead, as well as to endeavour to harry Wessex. An enemy who has towns to be burnt and cattle to be lifted is much more easily dealt with than a mere marauder who has nothing to lose, and whose basis of operations is the sea. In the tenth century the tables had been completely turned between Englishman and Dane—it was the former who generally took the offensive, and it is noteworthy that they worked on the very lines that their adversaries had used thirty years before—making a similar use of fortified positions with ditch and palisade for the purpose of holding the enemy at bay. Edward the Elder worked against the Danelagh with a regular succession of *ἐπιτειχίσματα*, as a Greek would have called them, building up a fort opposite every Danish town, and keeping a permanent garrison there to contain the sallies of the inhabitants and hold down the neighbourhood. The decisive battle of Brunanburh, where the English defeated a great confederacy of English Danes, Vikings from Ireland, and Scots, marks the final end of the period of danger from the invaders from the north.

The influence of the Danes had marked itself on English warfare, not merely by the changes that it caused in organisation, but by certain novelties of equipment for which the English were indebted to their adversaries. These were the introduction of the long kite-shaped shield, which seems to have almost superseded the earlier round shield by the end of the tenth century, and the adoption of the great Danish axe as a national weapon. This was something very different from the old Saxon axe, being no missile, but a massive head, a foot long in the blade, fitted to a five-feet handle, and wielded by both hands. By the time of Edward the Confessor it had superseded the sword as the typical weapon of the English thegnhood. Every authority agrees as to the fearful wounds which it could inflict when wielded by strong arms. It could cleave helm and skull to the very shoulders, lop off a thigh, and even sweep off the head of a horse.

The wars of the unhappy reign of Ethelred the Redeless, when the power of the kingdom of united England suddenly collapsed before the attacks of Swegen and Canute, bring out one or two new facts. From the military point of view, the land fell a victim to the danger of feudal decentralisation, due



to the mistaken policy of King Eadgar in cutting up his realm into great ealdormanies, whose rulers grew too independent and failed to help each other in the hour of peril. Instead of the king heading the united thegnhood of the whole kingdom, backed by the national fyrd, we find the great Ealdormen at the head of separate provincial levies, maintaining a spasmodic warfare without lending each other assistance. The fall of the Saxon house was finally accomplished in 1013, when the Ealdormen of Northumbria and East Anglia took Swegen to lord and master, and repudiated their allegiance to Ethelred. When such action by provincial magnates had become possible, the rule of the king had obviously become a mere fiction, and feudal independence had practically replaced it.

The rule of Canute was notable in England, not merely for his temporary suppression of the danger of disintegration, by the rough method of the summary murder of the great earls of Mercia and Northumbria, Uhtred and Eadric, but for the introduction of a new military element into the kingdom. Canute retained with him, when he sent the rest of his army home to Denmark, a small standing army of picked mercenaries—his “hus-carles,” or military household. They were not a comparatively small body like the gesiths of an ancient Saxon king, nor were they rewarded with lands and allowed to dwell apart from their lord. But, to the number of several thousands, they constantly followed the king, and formed the nucleus of any force that he had occasion to raise.

This institution survived after the death of Canute. Both his sons, and their successors, Edward the Confessor and Harold Godwinson, maintained under arms this body of picked men. The royal house-carles were the core of the armies with which Earl Siward smote Macbeth’s Scots, and Earl Harold hunted down the Welsh of King Griffith.

THE first things which strike us about the earliest English literature which has survived till to-day are its extreme antiquity, and, in spite of its very fragmentary state, its bulk when compared with the early literary monuments of other Germanic races. The Gothic translation of the New Testament by Ulfilas and his disciples is, of course, considerably older than the earliest

H. FRANK HEATH.  
Old English  
Literature.

Old English remains which deserve the name of literature, but neither Gothic nor any other Continental tongue can show any original work to compare in antiquity with "Beowulf," and whilst the oldest German poem surviving, the "Hildebrandslied" (about the end of the eighth century), is but a small fragment, the "Beowulf" is a complete work. The next point to be noticed is the fact that the earliest English literature is poetry, prose coming into prominence when the poetic age was past. In this the English follow the same course of development as the Greeks, the Romans, and indeed, all the Aryans.

If we are called upon to label this Old English poetry, and place it in one of the recognised pigeon-holes which critics have made for the classification

**Epic Poetry.**

of poetic productions, we shall see that the bulk of it is best to be described as "epic." The popular idea of the meaning of the word "epic" is largely determined by a long literary tradition coming down from Homer to the time of Addison and Johnson, who furnished people with neat recipes for the manufacture of this kind of poem; but this, at any rate, is clear—that what we understand as national in opposition to literary epic belongs to that stage of social development which we call "heroic." In the heroic age the individual counts for a great deal; and his deeds, if he be a strong man, are of much greater comparative value to his people than in later times when organisation has allotted a share of the general work to each man, and evils of all sorts are warded off by systematic co-operation under the guidance of appointed leaders. As a result the strong man (be he Theseus, who slays the Minotaur; or Hercules, who cleanses the Augean stables; or Beowulf, who kills the dragon or the marsh-fiends) wins much gratitude for himself and a large amount of attention for his deeds. His exploits are felt to be of deep national importance, and to express in a very real way national aspirations and the national life. And when around the hearths of the rich and powerful the valorous deeds of such a man are sung by the native bard, be he *αοιδός* or *glêðman*,\* it is an epic lay or ballad which the audience listens to. If some shaping hand should bring together several such lays, all dealing with various

\* "Scop" has a more special meaning, being applied to a poet attached to some princely court.

adventures of one hero, and imparts unity to the whole, we have such an epos as "The Wrath of Achilles"—the "Odyssey"—or "Beowulf." It must be evident from this that the character of the hero, as distinguished from the situations in which he is placed, is the important thing in epic poetry, whilst in romantic just the reverse is the case. At the same time there was a tendency to raise the hero above the human level; the very fact that he was felt to embody the national genius aided this, whilst a decline of the popular belief in the truth of their mythology prevented any feeling that sacrilege had been committed. We find therefore, so soon as the myths began to be treated artistically and put into literary form, that the gods tended to become more human in character, whilst the favourite heroes rose in the scale and were conceived of as demigods. Parallel to this change of mental attitude, a development of style had taken place in the expression of thought. The old religious hymns, which were intended for choral song, and had therefore been composed in strophic form, gave place to a less excited kind of verse, better suited to the recounting of a series of important events, in which, with the same end in view, the lines were no longer arranged into stanzas. And as civilisation grew, and attention came to be given to the details of life, so the poets, who at first had been content with a curt and pointed style which told the main facts and no more, such as we see in the Old German "Song of Hildebrand," introduced more and more detail into their treatment, adding in this way to the vividness of the character, actions, and life of the persons they represented. So English poetry in the sixth century had gained for itself that union of richness and vividness of handling which is characteristic of the epic style. At the same time it must not be supposed that English poetry ever reached the perfection of technique found in the Homeric epos. Many causes, and chief amongst them the introduction of Christianity at the end of the sixth century, nipped this form of art just as it was commencing to open out into flower, and favoured forms of thought on the one hand, and offered false models of style on the other, which were fatal to its further growth. For instance, the Old English poet had a great love for descriptive appellatives which call attention to some one aspect of the person or object thought

of. These phrases\* are most often used in apposition to the noun or pronoun they refer to—*e.g.*, “Therefore thanks be to the Holy one That he has deemed us worthy, *the prince of glory, The eternal Lord*, for all time.” † [“Seafarer,” l. 122 ff.] Often, however, these paraphrases are used instead of the noun. In the later Old English poetry, under the influence of Cynewulf and his school, they are much more frequent and far more artificial; indeed, this particular kind of “conceit” becomes almost as pronounced as, in the seventeenth century, in the work of Cowley or amongst “Les Précieuses,” who spoke of a glass of water as *un bain intérieur*.

Whilst, however, Old English poetry is so rich in the use of appellatives, it is surprisingly sparing in its use of descriptive epithets; and so seldom does it make use of a complete simile that this figure of speech may be said to be non-existent.‡ In both these latter beauties the Homeric epic, on the contrary, is particularly rich. Old English poetry is highly metaphorical, and fond of periphrastic nouns and phrases, but very poor in adjectives and carefully-elaborated similes; the Homeric poems are poor in Kenningar, but very rich in suitable epithets and in similes full of highly-wrought and elaborate detail. The passionate restlessness of the Germanic genius did not allow time for lengthened pauses in the story, but hurried on to the main issue, caring as little for reflection or illustrative examples as it did for subjective analysis.

If we remember, finally, that Old English poetry was much addicted to the repetition, not merely of individual words and phrases, but also of whole thoughts, expressing the same fact from a different point of view twice or even three times—a repetition which makes the story halt—we shall have some idea of its chief characteristics and limitations. Other peculiarities, chiefly syntactical, would lead us too far afield.

\* Technically called Kenningar (*i.e.*, tokens), the term used for them in old Norse poetry.

† This is also an example of another characteristic of the Old English poetic style, *viz.*, disjointed apposition, the separation of the words in apposition from the word which they qualify.

‡ There are only four similes in the whole of “Beowulf”—*viz.*, ll. 218, 727, 985, and 1608—all of the simplest description. The last and longest describes Beowulf’s sword as melting like the ice when God, who has power over times and seasons, loosens the frost-fetters of winter, but it is a late interpolation by a Christian scribe.

A word must be said here upon the form of verse which the English, in common with the other Germanic tribes, made use of. This is controversial ground, but the main facts are clear. Old English versification is based upon rhythm, not upon metre, and also upon the law that verse-accent must fall together with the natural word-stress. As it was intended to be sung, the important thing was that there should be a fixed number of beats in the line, not that there should be a definite number of syllables. Each normal line accordingly has two *chief*\* accents in each half, the whole being divided into two by a very marked pause in the middle of the verse. In the best period, that previous to Cynewulf, little or no use is made of rime, but three out of the four syllables which bear the chief accents in each line are marked by alliteration. In the first half-line both syllables bearing a chief accent alliterate, in the second half only the first of the two alliterates with those of the previous half-line. In this way stress is laid upon the most important words, and the unity of the two half-lines is made apparent. In the case of consonantal alliteration, the combinations *sc*, *sp*, and *st* count as single sounds. When the alliteration consists of *spiritus lenis* or smooth breaking, the rule requires that each of the three syllables in the line should commence with a different vowel. The following examples will illustrate what has been said :—

" <i>Gôd</i> mid <i>Geat</i> um,	<i>Grendles</i> dæda" (" <i>Beow.</i> ," l. 195).
" on <i>stefn</i> <i>stigon</i> ;	<i>stréamas</i> wundon" (" <i>Beow.</i> ," l. 212).
" <i>eofer</i> <i>îren</i> -heard,	<i>æbeling</i> manig" (" <i>Beow.</i> ," l. 1112).

English poets, however, allowed themselves considerable freedom in the treatment of this scheme, and not only are the unaccented syllables which should occur between the accented ones often wanting, but some lines lack one of the sub-accents, others contain more than the allotted number of both. This latter especially in the later or sacred epic.

The greatest of the Old English poems is the epic of "Beowulf," which has come down to us almost entire in a MS. now in the Cottonian Library at the British Museum. [Vitellius A. xv.]

The poem has a partly mythical and partly historical

\* Also two sub-accents in each hemistich, though this is denied by the followers of Sievers.

basis. The mythical saga of the conquest over Grendel, and the slaughter of the dragon by Beowa, represents the constant struggle of the Germanic coast-tribes with the storms of the North Sea. This legendary element was attributed soon after the English colonisation of Britain to an historical hero, Beowulf, the grandson of Hygelac or Chocilaicus, king of the Géats, who between A.D. 512 and 520 had led a plundering expedition to the lower reaches of the Rhine, and who lost his life in battle with the victorious Theodobert, the Frankish king's son. In this battle Beowulf, the son of Ecgtheow, a man of gigantic build and strength, greatly distinguished himself, and after his death this Danish hero and his deeds gradually became merged in the person and heroic actions of the demi-god Beowa. But though the hero of the poem is a Dane, the poem itself is of pure English origin, and first sprang into poetic form in Northumbria. One lay from Bernicia, and another from Deira, each dealt with distinct incidents in the hero's career. Thence the ballads spread southwards to Mercia, where they were added to, elaborated, woven together into an epic poem, and written down, with the introduction here and there of Christian colouring. This happened in the course of the eighth century. In the following century copies spread to Kent, and thence in the second half of the tenth century to the West Saxon who wrote the MS. which served as basis for the unique MS. we now possess. The poem tells how Beowulf, the thane of Hygelac, sails from Sweden to rid Heorot, the hall of Hrothgar, king of Jutland, from the scourge of the mere-fiend Grendel, who for twelve years has carried off and devoured the thanes of Hrothgar, rendering his mead-hall uninhabitable. Beowulf wrestles with the monster, who leaves his arm in the hero's vice-like grip, and flees to his mother's cave at the bottom of the mere to die. Next night his mother avenges her son's death, and Beowulf then attacks her in her haunt, and slays her also. The hero is richly rewarded, and returns laden with honour to Sweden, where, after the death of Hygelac and his son Heardred, he comes to the throne, and finally, as an old man, dies in the service of his country, after victorious combat with a fire-breathing dragon who has come to burn and ravage the land in revenge for being robbed of a treasure which he guards. The poem ends with the account

of the hero's body being burnt upon the top of a lofty cairn on the promontory of Hronesnaes.

Besides "Beowulf," we possess fragments of two other heroic poems belonging to the classical period of Old English. One, the "Battle of Finnsburg," deals with a war between the Danish Scyldings led by Hengest and the Jutes under Finn, who are besieged in his royal city called Finnsburg.\* Of the other epic, "King Waldere's Lay," two short fragments survive. The story is the same as that in Ekkehard's Latin poem of the tenth century, "Waltharius," and tells how Walther of Aquitaine fled with his beloved Hildegund and overcame the Burgundian King Gunther and his men, who were in pursuit, in the passes of the Vosges.

The other heroic fragment, "The Battle of Maldon," though written at the end of the Old English period (A.D. 991), deserves to be classified with the old epic poetry, because, in a period of national decline and of meretricious style in verse and prose, it stands as an almost miraculous example of fidelity to the old epic manner and the old heroic tone of thought. It is a description by an eye-witness of the last stand made by the East Saxon "earldorman," Byrhtnoð, against a band of invading Northmen on the banks of the Blackwater in Essex.

The tendency to melancholy, apt sometimes to become morbid and complaining, has often been noticed as a trait of the English character traceable from the earliest times, and it is one which seems curiously contradictory to the fearless courage, delight in sword-play, and resigned fatalism so characteristic of the old epic style. Still the trait, which may possibly be due to the admixture of Celtic blood, undoubtedly exists, and is occasionally to be traced in the heroic poems. It is, however, in another group of poems, which

are lyrical in form, that this strand in the woof of the national character is most plainly seen. The oldest of these, "Widsið" or "The Traveller's Song," is less sentimental than later poems such as the "Wanderer," "The Seafarer," and "The Wife's Complaint." This is natural, for the introduction of Christianity caused a softening of character: and the pathos, though

\* The saga is referred to in "Beowulf," ll. 1068-1159.



not greater than in the earlier work, is conscious instead of being unconscious and finding its expression in irony.

Round the name of Cædmon, who lived near the monastery of Streoneshalh (Whitby) in the latter part of the seventh century (d. 680), a number of important religious poems have been grouped. The romantic story told by Bede (*"Historia Eccl. Gentis Anglorum,"* lib. iv., c. 24) of Cædmon's inspiration in a dream is too well known to need repeating. King Alfred, in his translation of Bede, quotes what purports to be the hymn of praise composed by the poet on awaking, the sense of which is also given by the learned monk of Jarrow. There is no reason to doubt that this short Northumbrian poem is by Cædmon. Possibly also the older and less poetic portions of the metrical paraphrase of Genesis are based on his work, but a long passage in the middle (ll. 231–851) is evidently from the hand of another poet who had the Old Saxon *"Heliand"*\* before him as he wrote. Not a single line of the metrical Exodus, Daniel, or Judith is by him, nor is any part of the *"Crist and Satan,"* or *"The Vision of the Cross"*—all of them works formerly ascribed to this poet. The three poems last mentioned belong to the school of Cynewulf, Judith being much the finest of the whole group, and that which best preserves the old epic style. Exodus and Daniel differ markedly in style, and the treatment of their originals, both from each other and from the Genesis.

Cynewulf (b. between 720 and 730; d. about 800) was a Northumbrian, like Cædmon, but, unlike him, was a wandering bard by profession, who late in life passed through a religious crisis, and devoted his last years to religious poetry. A series of ninety-four riddles,† if Cynewulf's, is an early work. This form of ingenuity is one of the effects of Latin influence, which worked so detrimentally upon the style of Old English literature as a whole, and which show us that we are already in the period of decline. The century of riddles which went under the name of Symphosius, a Latin poet of the fourth century, were imitated in England by Aldhelm (Bishop of Sherborne, d. 709) and Tatwine (Archbishop of Canterbury, 731),

\* The *"Heliand"* (Healer) is a metrical version of the story of the New Testament written in Old Saxon.

† The so-called *"First Riddle"* is really a dramatic monologue, a companion poem to *"Deor's Complaint."*

and being taken in turn as model by Cynewulf, who also used the collection of Eusebius. Besides the riddles, the "Crist" (dealing with the three advents of Christ), the Lives of St. Juliana and St. Elene, and the Fates of the Apostles,\* are undoubtedly by Cynewulf. In all four poems the author has inserted his name in Runic letters. The "Descent into Hell," "Phoenix," and the Lives of St. Andreas and St. Guthlac are almost certainly his, and very possibly "The Vision of the Cross." Certain scholars have ascribed to Cynewulf all the poems in the Exeter and Vercelli codices; but some of these, such as Judith (c. 915), are certainly by later poets, who wrote under Cynewulf's influence—and one, the "Rhyming Poem," was written under Scandinavian influence in the second half of the tenth century.

A few words must now suffice for the prose literature. It is in the Old English "Chronicle," first written at Winchester, that a prose style slowly developed itself after the middle of the seventh century. The contemporary entries were at first very short and bald, but in the second quarter of the ninth century the chronicler, whoever he may have been, had already gained some sense of a vivid direct style, and under Alfred's influence great advances were made. This king did much literary work. He translated Gregory's "Pastoral Care" for the use of his clergy, and as well Bede's "Ecclesiastical History," Orosius's "History of the World," and Boethius's "De Consolatione Philosophiæ." He also kept a note-book (in which he jotted down things seeming worthy of record), unfortunately lost; and the translations of Boethius's "Metra" and of the "Psalms" are by some thought to be his. It would have been well for Old English prose had it continued to develop along the lines of clear and straightforward strength laid down by Alfred; but the religious prose of Ælfric and Wulfstan at the end of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh centuries, like the later verse, shows everywhere the evil effects of the late Latin models alone known to them. A highly-ornamented, involved, and semi-metrical style was accompanied by the allegorical treatment of the subject-matter so characteristic

\* There is reason to believe that "The Fates of the Apostles" is the epilogue to "Andreas," and not a separate work. Cf. Gollancz, Appendix to Cynewulf's "Crist," London, 1892.

1066]

of literature throughout Europe after 1100, and the development of an English prose style was put back for nearly five hundred years.

THE heathen invaders who at home were best known as English, and abroad as Saxons, brought with them from their homes in and around Schleswig little that can properly be termed art. They were excellent carpenters, and made tolerable boats. They certainly had some skill in the manufacture of bronze and iron, and possibly some knowledge of glass-making and gold-work. As regards their work in gold, however, it is significant that they had no special law to protect the goldsmith; and that while among the Franks the *werigild* for killing a slave who was a skilled worker in gold was actually higher than that for killing a freeman, the English in no way discriminated in his favour. As regards glass, too, we have the express testimony of Bede to the effect that when Abbot Benedict, of Monkwearmouth, began the work of church-building in the north, he sent not only for masons to France, but for workmen skilled in glass-making; and that these taught the English, not only to make window-glass, but glass cups, lamps, and drinking-vessels. This was in the last quarter of the seventh century; and fifty years later a pupil of Bede himself, writing to a French bishop, implores him to send somebody over capable of making glass, as the English did not possess the art. This is the more remarkable in view of the fact that the Saxon tombs explored in Kent and elsewhere (in which the interment has been of a non-Christian character, and which must belong either to the days before Augustine or to the pagan reaction in the following century) abound with fine work both in gold and in glass. They contain very curious cups adorned with pendulous ears—chiefly in olive-tinted glass—having the characteristic Saxon peculiarity that they will not stand up, and cinerary urns (sometimes in glass, sometimes in pottery), frequently decorated with raised patterns in scallops. Nor does Anglo-Saxon pottery, so far as we know it, ever rise higher than in these early and rude examples of pagan work. Of more importance is the sepulchral jewellery, which includes

R. HUGHES.  
Art and  
Architecture.

Ornaments.

necklaces, clasps, and brooches of great beauty and variety. These brooches, both of the round and long variety, if somewhat barren in design, are beautifully executed; and the polished garnets and vitrified pastes, mostly of crimson colour, and the rare turquoises with which they are ornamented, are often set with delicate gold braids, recalling the fineness and neatness of Etruscan work. Occasionally the Greek cross is met with, and later, Christian symbols become frequent. Most of this was at first, no doubt, of Frankish origin; but after the importation by Ælfred of skilled foreign artificers in gold, it is probable that the English craftsmen acquired high skill, so that the "King Ælfred jewel" found in the Isle of Athelney may just possibly be a native work. How far the goldsmith's art advanced in the centuries which preceded the Danish wars it is impossible to say, but the references to gold and precious stones, to bracelets and rings, in Bede and elsewhere, and detailed description of such gewgaws as a golden fly adorned with gems, and of gold "vermiculated" necklaces, suggest considerable skill in this minor art. But whatever proficiency may have been reached in the eighth century or before, we have the fact that at the end of the ninth, Ælfred had to send for men skilled in gold work from abroad; nor can we safely claim for the English goldsmith the crown four pounds in weight, and the two basons (all "of purest gold"), and the silver dishes which Ælfred sent as a present to the Pope.

Two arts, however, seem to have taken strong root in England, and never to have fallen into decay—the art of illumination, and the art of gold embroidery. The native poet and chronicler is loud in the praise of the Anglo-Saxon skill in the art of the weaver, and relates with enthusiasm how the shuttle, "filled not only with purple, but with all other colours, flies now this way, now that, among the close-spread threads," and how the embroiderer's art "glorified the wool-work with groups of pictures." For this they achieved something like European fame. The Germans, who excelled in this manufacture, came over to England to learn the trade, and the *opus Anglicum* was famous even in Italy. We hear of silk garments woven with golden eagles, with golden flowers, with gold and gems; and the ecclesiastical robes, especially the official pallium of the bishop, were frequently thus adorned. Two silken pallia

Weaving and  
Embroidery.

1066]

excited the admiration of Bede himself, and two more are included in the list of Ælfred's offerings to Rome. The passion for gay colours not only comes out in the effusive admiration of the native writers, but monks and nuns are warned, in frequent pastorals, not to give way to the besetting sin of acquiring and wearing many-coloured dresses. In the illuminated manuscripts we have abundant evidence of the prevailing passion, and in the well-known MS. of the Saxon Gospels the evangelists wear undergowns of purple, of light blue striped with red, of lilac, and of pea-green, and their robes are of all the colours of the rainbow. Time has softened many of these violent hues to an even and delightful harmony, but it would seem that the gift of a delicate colour-sense was not conspicuous among our ancestors. The pictures they had to study were few, and probably of Byzantine character—such as those of the Virgin and twelve apostles, and the illustration of the

Illumination.

Old and New Testaments imported from Rome by the energetic Abbot Benedict. The recipes for gold painting which have come down to us are numerous, and explain how, for their embossed gold letters, a foundation was carefully laid (in some preparation of chalk apparently), and afterwards elaborately burnished. They show a preference for symmetrically-knotted forms, but perhaps the Anglo-Saxon was at his best in dealing with conventional flowers and leaves, while as animal painters they leave much to be desired. If the pictures in these religious books are not of the highest value as works of art, the testimony which they bear to the state of civilisation is frequently precious. As witnesses, however, they cannot be implicitly relied on, for they frequently represent architectural features—such as the acanthus foliage on a capital—which could neither have been seen nor evolved in England. Their testimony, however, to the existence of many sorts of musical instruments—as where (in one of the Cotton MSS.)

David and his musicians are seen playing on an eleven-stringed harp, a viol, a trumpet, and a horn—is indisputable. When we add to this such incidents as Ælfred or Anlaf going with his harp into the enemy's camp, we are not left in doubt that at least by the ninth century the art of playing and perhaps of making musical instruments must have been quite common. Even as far back as Bede and Aldhelm we have reference to the organ

Musical  
Instruments.

with its thousand pipes (*millenis flabris*), and the *ventosi folles*, or bellows, with which it was blown.

Towards architecture the part played by the conquering tribes was simply that of ruthless destroyers ;  
**Architecture.** nor was there, to men engaged in carrying fire and sword over the abandoned province, any inducement to constructive work. Stockades or palisaded entrenchments were always their favourite "places of arms," and slight wooden halls and sheds were enough to shelter the war-king and his men. In the new country, as in the old, their idols and their altars were of wood, and even so late as the time of Charlemagne the great temple of the Irmensul (the idol of the inland Saxons) at Merseburg was of the same material. The description of this idol, which Charlemagne destroyed, with the rose in one hand and the scales in the other, the cock-crested helmet and the shield, leaves no doubt that it was carved in wood, the decorations being probably of gilt bronze, such as are found in English tombs of the pagan period. The ordinary Anglo-Saxon equivalent of the verb "to build" was "getimbrian," which simply means to construct of wood; and this plain fact of philology throws a strong light not only on the fewness of Anglo-Saxon lapidary remains, but on the peculiar character of the few that have come down to us.

It was the English custom to destroy every house of their enemies, and they would scarcely be more forbearing to the houses of their enemies' god. But, by some accident, the Roman-British church at Canterbury was left standing, and Augustine, with the assistance of King Æthelbert, recovered and apparently restored it. The beginnings of Latin Christianity were thus the beginnings of an architecture in England. The church as restored by Augustine has been ingeniously reconstructed for us by Professor  
**Ecclesiastical Buildings.** Willis, who shows grounds for supposing that in shape it was the oblong, or double square, affected by the Italian architects, that it had an apse at each end, the high altar of the presbytery at the east, that of the lady chapel at the western extremity—the eastern half being devoted to the use of the clergy, the western to that of the laity. A hundred and fifty-three years after the conversion of Æthelbert, Archbishop Cuthbert added a baptistery; in



1066]

A.D. 950 Archbishop Oddo raised the stone walls and rebuilt the roof. Unfortunately a year after Senlac it was totally destroyed by fire. It never, however, seems to have been taken as a model by the Saxon builders, who were essentially workers in wood and profoundly ignorant of masonry. The importance which they attribute to the building of a church in the Roman manner—that is, of stone—is by itself some evidence of this prevailing ignorance; and there can be no doubt that the churches which sprang up all over England after the conversion of the country to Christianity were made of the more common and perishable material. Even in the ninth and tenth centuries we hear of the worm-eaten walls of cathedrals, and the miraculous preservation of wooden pillars which a saint had leaned against. We can only guess what they were like from the portions of interiors depicted in illuminated MSS., which show us as a rule small buildings in form perhaps more like the wooden churches of Norway than any other existing buildings. They were decorated internally with paintings in various bright colours, but no authentic specimen of Anglo-Saxon mural decoration has been preserved.

St. Augustine's cathedral was, no doubt, the first place of worship of the Christianised Englishman, but it was hardly an English church. To find that, we must go to Monkwearmouth and Jarrow, built, as Bede tells us, by Benedict, who crossed the sea into

**Stone Churches  
in the North.**

Gaul, and carried back with him masons to build him a stone church. This was about A.D. 680, and by the beginning of the next century the fame of the stone churches built by Benedict and Wilfrith in the north of England had reached the Pictish king, who sent for architects to Ceolfred, abbot of Jarrow, that he might have a church in Scotland built "in the Roman manner." Probably it is to a slightly earlier period that we may refer the unmortared stone hermitages, while the stone-roofed churches and round towers belong to a somewhat later date; but, of course, all of these are anything rather than English. Certain portions of the work of these early saints (Benedict and Wilfrith) fortunately still exist, and the fragments of Roman mouldings built into their walls show that they already knew where to go for their materials. The best preserved remains seem to have been cells or shrines for relics, with



steps on each side, so that the faithful might pass down, see the body of the saint, and pass up on the other side. Benedict's doorway at Monkwearmouth is probably the most authentic specimen of Early Anglo-Saxon work that remains to us. The arch is very low and heavy. The pillars that support it are grooved in imitation of wood turned in a lathe, and the bottom stone of the right doorpost is decorated with twined beaked serpents resembling the kind of decoration which survives in Anglo-Saxon illuminations. The church at Bradford-on-Avon may be perhaps a later restoration, though originally built by Aldhelm of Sherborne, who received a charter from Ina of Wessex in A.D. 705. In form it is a simple rude arched structure, but it contains small figures of angels with scrolls, which resemble drawings in the Benedictional of St. Æthelwald more than a century and a half later. To make the riddle harder, a Norman window has been cut in the old wall, a shallow incised arcade forms part of the exterior decoration, and the close-jointed stones are puzzlingly suggestive not only of Norman work, but Norman work of the twelfth century.

The coming of the Danes, no doubt, did much to put a stop to building in England in the ninth century; and the approach of the millennial year (A.D. 1000), accompanied by the apprehension that the end of the world was at hand, further discouraged architecture during the tenth. As a result, though a few fragments of higher antiquity may be pointed out, the greater number of the Saxon churches of which a substantial part remains above ground only date from the eleventh century. Many of them were no doubt due to the filial piety of Canute, who raised anew the churches which his father had burned, and whose order to rebuild Essendune is preserved in the Saxon Chronicle. The complete establish-

**Danish Church-  
Building.**

panied by an outburst of pious interest in church-building; and last, and not least, there was the impulse derived from contact with the Normans. This eleventh-century work is distinguished by the alternate "long and short" quoins at the angles of the walls, such as are seen at Earl's Barton in Northampton and Coshampton in Hampshire. Still more characteristic are the long narrow lath- or pilaster-like strips

1066]

of stone joined by arches and straight braces, with which the walls are decorated, which are unmistakably taken from wooden originals. The apertures of the windows, too, are generally small, so that eye-holes (the Anglo-Saxon word for them) seems not inappropriate. Not unfrequently they are formed with what Mr. Fergusson calls "gouty balustrades," and the embrasures disproportionately splayed (sometimes on both sides), while the window arch is not seldom replaced by an actual triangle. But the influence which began with the Norman Emma, Queen of Æthelred and of Canute, became predominant with the Confessor, whose reign was, of course, a great building era. Of the choir and transepts at Westminster built by that pious monarch and consecrated a few days before his death, little remains but the substructure of the monk's dormitory and the lowest part of the walls of the refectory. It is all clumsy, round-arched work, with the wide-jointed masonry typical of the earliest Norman work. In truth, this work is what might be expected of a prince bred and born in Norman traditions, and it is only in the historical, and not at all in the architectural sense, that it can be called Anglo-Saxon.

As regards the domestic architecture of the Saxons we have to guess what it was like. Poets, as in the epic of Beowulf, talk of pinnacled halls, and the illuminations show us crenellated roofs. But it is probable that wood never ceased to be the material for lay buildings, though when churches were being built "in the Roman manner" a king's thane here and there may have occasionally replaced his wooden doorposts with stone pillars. The castle was not a Saxon institution, and their burghs were probably shingle-roofed houses surrounded by a stockaded moat. It is significant that of all the castles enumerated in Domesday only Arundel is mentioned as having existed in the Confessor's time.

**Domestic  
Architecture.**

If we except the reigns of the first Norman and Angevin kings, the die-sinker's art in England seems to have reached its lowest ebb under the Anglo-Saxon monarchy. This is the more remarkable because an indigenous coinage came into existence as far back as the seventh century. Copper stycas or mites and sceathas which approached the penny in value, in base metal, in silver, and

**Coins.**

even in gold, were struck thus early in Northumbria. Nor do they seem to have gone entirely out of use until the Danish conquest under Halfdene in the ninth century. They are rude imitations of the coins of the usurper Maximus, and sometimes bear a Runic, sometimes a Latin lettering; sometimes neither one nor the other, but with marks that might be copied from either by a person wholly ignorant of both. Next in point of date come a few Kentish coins, but it is not until the reign of the Mercian Offa (A.D. 765—791) that genuine English coinage can be said to have existed. It is uncertain whether Offa actually visited Rome, but his comparatively elegant coinage was undoubtedly the fruit of his intercourse with the Eternal City, and not unconnected with the annual tribute of 365 mancuses paid to the Pope. This was a considerable sum, for the mancus was equal to thirty pennies. It apparently had to be paid in coin, for such a necessity can alone explain the undoubted existence of an Arabian dinar with "Offa Rex" on it, turned the wrong way, so as to be upside down to the genuine Koranic legend. The Saxon gold coins are few in number. There are the gold *scæltas* of Northumbria, copied from the Romans; a few specimens of the *triens*, copied from the Franks; this Arabic dinar; and some doubtful pieces, one of which shows the head of Edward the Confessor, and which seems to have been a gold imitation of a real silver coin, made to serve as a pendant to a necklace. The silver coins are numerous, not only of the separate kingdoms of the Octarchy, but of the monarchy from Æthelstan downwards, and of divers bishoprics and abbacies. They are chiefly pennies, but from about the end of the ninth century halfpennies occur, though these were not struck in all reigns—change for a penny being obtained by halving or quartering it with the knife. The coins are valuable, not so much as pieces of art, as pieces of history; and not only for the portraits they preserve of kings and saints, but for the light they throw on the sayings of chroniclers—as, for instance, when the alleged increase of intercourse with the Court of Aachen is corroborated by the appearance of the Carlovingian temple-front on the mintage of a Saxon king. The series of portraits, too, rough though they are, is far from being without interest; and it would have been more extensive had not the centralising Æthelstan, while licensing the episcopal mints,

1086]

sternly forbidden the stamping of any head except his own. Even in these earliest times, and in the not specially English art of coin-striking, the English native talent is strong in the portraiture of character; and technically feeble as its delineations are, they leave us in no doubt as to the vicious weakness of Eadwig's countenance, or the coarse strength of that of Harold II.

ENGLAND seems of all countries the best fitted by climate, situation, configuration, and products, for maritime trade. The earlier accounts of the Saxons in their old home represent them as daring seafarers. In their flat-bottomed "keels," with skins stretched over wickerwork for the sides, they carried their piracies into the German Ocean and the Bay of Biscay; and "welcomed the storm as concealing their approach or dispersing their enemies." Yet when these Saxons and Angles, after generations of predatory assaults, finally, in the fifth century, invaded Britain, and—bringing with them their wives, children, slaves, and even cattle—transformed the Romanised and Christian country into a veritable Engle-land, heathen and uncivilised, they seem at once to have dropped their use of the sea. They built no more ships, they made no more adventurous voyages for traffic or for spoil.

A. L. SMITH.  
Trade and  
Industry.

Maritime Trade.

The early history of England in regard to commerce and to industrial development is almost a blank. Save for a few scattered allusions, it might be supposed to have no commerce at all till after the Norman Conquest; and no exports, save of raw products, till much later still. It is significant that the "chapman" occurs only three times in the whole body of Anglo-Saxon laws. The fact also that so many of the coast names, even outside the Danish districts, are Scandinavian in form (-ness, -vick, and -by) points to the external traffic being mainly in the hands of northern traders. In the letter, however, of Charles the Great to Offa of Mercia we hear of English traders who joined the companies of pilgrims to pass safely through foreign territories, but also to smuggle the wares on which they should have paid customs dues. These wares were probably articles of gold and silver work.

King Alfred's embassies to the Patriarch of Jerusalem and to the Christians in India seem to indicate some commercial as well as religious purpose. In his translation of Orosius he inserted the accounts which he got from Othere the Northman and from Wulfstan. The latter describes the Eastland tribes (of Prussia) reached by the Baltic. Othere describes the reindeer and the whale fishery of his own home in Halgoland—where he dwelt “northmost of all the Northmen”—and the marten, deer, otter, and bear skins, the eiderdown and whalebone, the ropes made from whale and seal skins, which the Fins brought in as tribute, and which northern chapmen no doubt brought on to England. Othere had doubled the North Cape, penetrated through the White Sea to the site of Archangel, and brought back walrus ivory to “his lord, King Alfred.” When Alfred built his new ships to confront the Danish

**Alfred's  
Shipbuilding.**

“ashes,” and built them “full nigh twice as large, swifter and stauncher and higher, some with sixty oars and some with more,” he was able in a few years to defeat the fleet of the East Anglian Danes, but he had to get “pirates” from Friesland to man them. His son Edward could collect a hundred ships to hold the Channel; and there is no reason to doubt William of Malmesbury's account of Edgar's yearly progress with a fleet round the coasts. Such a navy must have had some commercial marine to feed it. Indeed, a law—probably of Athelstan's time—aims at such encouragement by declaring “every merchant who fared thrice across the wide sea at his own cost to be of thegn-right worthy.” It is probable, too, that the law, which we find in force under Edgar and Ethelred, to the effect that every three hundreds, of the coast-line doubtless, should furnish a ship, had been enacted much earlier with the same object. From the time of Athelstan English fleets are frequently mentioned, and the table of the port dues laid down by Ethelred for London shows a brisk trade with Normandy, France, Ponthieu, Flanders, and other places. These and “the men of the Emperor,” who were to be deemed

**Imports and  
Exports.**

“worthy of good laws even as ourselves,” brought wine, fish, cloths, pepper, gloves, vinegar. The merchant in Ælfric's Dialogues is named as bringing in his own ship skins, silks, gems, gold, cloths, pigments, wine, oil, ivories, brass, copper, tin, silver,

glass, and such-like ; " sometimes," he says, " I suffer shipwreck, with the loss of all my things, scarcely escaping myself." These goods would for the most part come from Constantinople to Venice, thence overland to Flanders, and so by sea to England. In various Anglo-Saxon documents we find that silks, though highly valued, are not uncommon ; " wine is drunk by the elders and the wise," and was allowed to monks on days of festivity. From the north and east came furs, skins, ropes, masts, weapons, and ironwork. The exports which paid for all this were chiefly of raw produce. Cornish tin and lead from the Peak District were staple products, as in Roman times. There is reason to believe that other mines yielded silver and even gold. Silver and gold trinkets of English make are heard of as early as the seventh century. The high price of wool and the value of the fleece as compared with the price of sheep suggests that English wool was already, as it continued to be for many centuries, the main source which fed the clothing towns of Flanders. The export of horses is mentioned and restricted by a law of Athelstan. But the chief trade of all, to judge by the documentary evidence, was the trade in slaves. The story of the Northumbrian boys, whose fairness moved the pity of Gregory in the market-place of Rome, and made him vow that their land should be taught the true faith, carries back this traffic well into the sixth century. Warfare, debt, crime, are the modes by which in the early German laws men become slaves. The English invaders of Britain brought their theows or thralls with them, and the long gradual progress of the invaders westward must have produced a constant supply of slaves from the conquered Welsh. But mediæval Christianity, though it may have acquiesced too easily in serfdom, did at least set its face firmly against slavery. The prohibitions began in Ine's Law, and are repeated down to Ethelred's, " that Christian men and uncondemned be not sold out of the country, especially into a heathen nation ; and be it jealously guarded against that those souls perish not that Christ bought with His own life." They are more fully expressed in the canons and penitentials of the Church. Above all, the contemporary biographer of Wulfstan describes in a curious passage the good bishop's efforts to turn from their evil ways the traders of Bristol, who had in the eleventh century the

same character in this respect as in the eighteenth. "The people of Bristol had an odious and inveterate custom of buying men and women in all parts of England, and exporting them to Ireland for gain. The young women they carried to market in their pregnancy, that they might get a better price . . . nor were these men ashamed to sell into slavery their nearest relatives—nay, even their own children." William of Malmesbury, writing a century later, states that a similar practice was still not unknown in the north of England.

The development of an inland trade may to some extent be measured by the development of a town population. It is clear that before the thirty or forty boroughs walled and fortified by Alfred in the southern shires, and by his sister Æthelflœd of Mercia in the midlands and the north, and afterwards by Alfred's successors, England was almost without towns. The Teutonic spirit still, in Tacitus's phrase, regarded walled cities as the strongholds of slavery. It is difficult to believe that there was ever a time when the Roman walls and basilicas and forums of cities like London and York stood utterly untenanted; but yet we know such was actually the case with Chester, Silchester, and other Roman sites. In all but a few of the old cities at any rate town-life only sprang up afresh after an interval of desolation. The English "burh" or walled enclosure was in organisation and in character, as in origin, no other than a more populous hamlet. Where a Roman street forded the river, or where a shrine (like St. Frideswide's at Oxford) attracted pilgrims, or hard by an ancient site where the Roman remains could be used as a quarry, or up the estuary of a river like the Yare or the Exe, these were the conditions under which the township came to be a "port" or borough.

This slow and broken growth is well illustrated by the facts of the early history of London. When Mellitus came to preach there in 601 it is clear that he found but a scanty and a heathen population. The old line of the Watling Street was lost; the space about St. Paul's was apparently deserted. A century later it had become "the mart of many traders"—Frisians and Easterlings, French and Picards, probably. It had a separate wic-reeve. Its increase to the east and south is traceable in the churches



founded there. When Alfred re-conquered it from the Danes and rebuilt its walls, it was already an important place. London Bridge, which stood so many a fierce Danish assault afterwards, probably existed already. Under Athelstan there were eight mints at work in it; and the ordinances of its gild, by which its citizens grouped themselves in their tens and hundreds, and met monthly to settle the gild accounts, were confirmed by him and the Witan. To all this progress the Church influence had greatly contributed. The folk-moot met in St. Paul's precincts at the sound of the great bell; the armed levy marched under St. Paul's banner. The bishop saw to it that weights and measures were true. The city grew fast in population; of the total Danegeld of £72,000 paid to Canute from all England, London's share was £10,500. It had practically displaced Winchester as the capital.

But the influx of Danish settlers early in the eleventh century had the compensating disadvantage, of which one chronicler tells, that it made the city "half barbarian." Certainly London till perhaps the Tudor time retained a strong foreign character; it was the purse, often the brain, it has been well observed, but perhaps never the heart of mediæval England.

London seems to have been the only town on the Thames till the tenth century. The latest authority puts the foundation of Oxford not before 912. River Traffic and  
Town Life. Yet the rivers would be the natural channels of trade; and Oxford must have had some form of market and chepe-place, even when it was no more than an open village. We find an abbot of Abingdon cutting a new barge channel in return for a toll of herrings. In the same manner the Trent was a highway of trade, and tolls were taken on it by the men of Nottingham. Similarly with other rivers. Gloucester had a nunnery from 681, a mint from Alfred's day, and must always have been a meeting-place of Welsh and English. Bristol probably sprang up long before Canute's day, when is found the first mention of it. It seems to date back to the time of Mercian greatness, which ended with Offa. Chester had its local trade in cattle, sheep, and dairy produce with the pasture lands across the Ribble, and its Irish trade with the Ostmen of Dublin and Waterford. The importance of Exeter which appears markedly at the Norman Conquest,

was due to the Exe, which was then navigable up to the city. Of the Cinque Ports and such coast towns, Sandwich may be taken as typical. It had a great herring fishery. Ethelred made it the meeting-place for his fleet; Tostig manned his ships with its "butsecarls." The Codex Diplomaticus shows that the tolls there and rights of "wreck" and "strand," granted by charter from Canute to Christ Church, Canterbury, were valued at more than £30 a year; and that jealousy of this valuable grant roused the rival Abbey of St. Augustine's to work hard, though vainly, at a scheme for supplanting Sandwich by a new port at a little distance. Judging by the number of mints in each, the other towns of chief importance in the south, besides Winchester, Canterbury, and Rochester, were Southampton, Lewes, Shaftesbury, Wareham, Hastings, and Chichester. In the eastern shires Norwich, Dunwich, and Ipswich appear most prominent, all depending largely on their fisheries. Further north, York and Lincoln were conspicuous, not yet displaced by Hull and Boston. Yet even York had a population of less than 10,000; and all the eighty towns that can be collected from Domesday Book would not furnish together a population of 200,000.

An Anglo-Saxon borough was little more than a collection of wooden thatched huts with two or three small churches, some having towers built for refuge and defence—the whole borough included within a wall strengthened by buttresses and by a stockade, and perhaps further protected by a moat or ditches. They were for the most part market centres rather than manufacturing, and a great part of their activity was simply agricultural. The borough was only an enlarged township. Like other townships, it had its arable fields and pasture and common woodland; its men were serfs of a neighbouring lord, and bound to plough, mow, and reap for him, or to pay in commutation their plough-penny and rep-silver, their wood-money and "gafol." If their lord was the king, their burdens took a more public character; *e.g.*, at Romney fifty burgesses bound to do service at sea were freed from all other payments except fines; in Oxford twenty for the whole town went out for war service at the king's call. Often these commutations to the king or other lord take the form of local produce as well as money. Thus Chester paid £45 and three bundles of

**The Anglo-Saxon  
Town.**

1066]

martens' skins; Oxford, £20 and six measures of honey; Dunwich, £50 and sixty thousand herrings. Often a rent is paid in eels, of which there appears to have been an enormous production. The vast fen-lands and meres, the undrained rivers and undisturbed estuaries, account for this, as for the great number of salmon fisheries—thirty-three on the Dee, worked by lessees, sixty-five on the Severn, and so on. Fish entered into the national dietary far more than it does now, not merely for fast-days, but because the only winter meat except game was salted. In Ælfric's Dialogues, besides the ordinary river fish, salt-water fish, and shell-fish, "sea-swine" or porpoises and sturgeons are also named; but to the question, "Why do you not fish in the sea?" the fisher answers, "Sometimes I do; but rarely, for it needs a big ship . . . many take whales and get a great price, but I dare not from the fearfulness of my mind."

Industries.

X

Perhaps the chief industry next to agriculture and fishing was that of salt-making; in six shires 727 salt-works are named, paying rents to their lords. There are about 5,000 mills mentioned in Domesday; these were water-mills for the grinding of corn. Barley-meal appears to have been the usual food; and among the poor, mixtures of rye, oats, and beans. Wheaten bread was for the well-to-do or for feast-days. One of the first handicrafts must have been that of the forge; iron-smiths and coppersmiths are often named: Domesday notices six forges in the town of Hereford. Glasswork—used for lamps and vessels, as Bede shows, and more rarely for windows—was introduced with the foreign workmen brought in by Abbot Benedict in the seventh century. The shoemaker describes himself as making shoes and gaiters, bottles and harness, and all manner of leather articles. Other trades described are the carpenter, baker, cook. The arts of embroidery and weaving seem to have been far advanced, and their products were famous on the Continent. But no doubt many necessities were supplied by home industry, and craftsmen who worked for sale were relatively few. The larger monasteries were great industrial centres; an abbey like St. Edmunds or Glastonbury would have its own smiths, carpenters, millers, masons, its fishers, huntsmen, and tillers. Edgar's law laid down that every priest should learn some handicraft. The

state of some of these arts is indicated in the account of such a church as that which Wilfrid built at Hexham, "of polished stones with many columns and porticoes, with great height and length of walls. It had many windings, both above and below, carried round in spirals; and a stone pavement inside. It was superior to any building this side of the Alps." Or, again, to take the list of Dunstan's accomplishments—he knew masonry, carpentry, and smith's work; could draw, and paint, and design; was a musician and composer, and a maker of musical instruments. There was much wealth stored up in rich hangings, gold and silver vessels, and jewellery. We read of tables and cups, crucifixes, and dishes, all of gold and Alfred's father took to Rome a crown of pure gold 4 lb. in weight. The laws to protect property and put down theft and robbery were numerous and savagely severe.

**Markets and Fairs.** Markets were frequent and productive; *e.g.*, that of Taunton was worth £2 10s. a year in fees Bedford, £7. The great fairs like Winchester, Stourbridge, and Abingdon brought a large concourse from all parts. And yet it is clear that trade had to struggle against manifold and almost overwhelming difficulties. Every road, river, and harbour was hampered with heavy tolls, and seignorial rights of "wreck" and "strand," of "team" and "infangthief." Every transaction "over twenty pence" was to take place in a borough town "before unlying witnesses." All property must have its warrantor ready to identify and trace it. Every town's trade was coming more under the jealous control of an exclusive gild.

**Agriculture.** It is with the agricultural and rural side of Anglo-Saxon social life that the most interesting problems are connected. The so-called "mark system," if it ever existed at all, never existed in its complete form on English soil. The tribes who followed Hengist and Cerdic still grouped themselves in villages according to ties of kindred; and still kept the pasture ground and the waste land of the village common and undistributed; and still for the tradition of equality made each man's share of the arable to consist of many separate and scattered "acres" in each of the open arable fields. The whole cultivation was done in common by a common plough-team of eight or twelve oxen, to which each villager would bring his single ox or yoke of

1066]

oxen. The arable consisted generally of three fields—one sown with corn, one sown with a spring crop, and one lying fallow for the year. But the English tribes had in several respects passed out of the ruder stage of a “mark” community. Property in land had become individual, and permanent inequality, too, had come in. Above all, from the very earliest days of the new settlers we can discern that tendency to dependence of the weaker landowners upon the greater which was at work to produce what we call feudalism. If we pass at once to the close of the Anglo-Saxon period as portrayed for us in Domesday Book, what we see there is the almost universal prevalence of the manor, or village community no longer of free allodial landowners, but of dependent holders under a lord. The free “ceorl” of older days has become the “villan” as known to Norman lawyers. Some recent writers have even argued that our social history begins with a population not of freemen but of serfs; that in no other way can we account for the uniformity of the services exacted from village communities all over England even before the Norman period. But there is a considerable weight of political and literary evidence on the other side; and the older view, which sees in serfdom a slow and late result of the causes which were for centuries at work to depress the small free landowners must be regarded as still holding its ground. Among these causes were the insecurity which prevailed through the long period of Danish wars; the constant growth of a thegn class of landholders enriched by royal grants from crown land with the jurisdiction thereon, and the pressure of laws such as that of Athelstan, that every man should have a lord to produce him at the folk-moot when required.

The whole social development of the Anglo-Saxon period seems at first sight meagre and disappointing. In some respects it seems even reactionary, as in the decay of the old freedom into feudal servitude. But that freedom was little better than chaos and anarchy. Six hundred years may be deemed a long period, but it counts as no more than an episode in the age-long making and progress of the English nation. It was none too long to turn war into peace, heathendom into Christianity, and petty jealous tribes into a united people; to draw the outlines of centralised government, and

to lay the foundations of a vigorous town-life, and a commerce cramped and timid as yet, but ready in a moment to break into luxuriant growth.

To form any adequate idea of the changes brought about by the invaders who dealt out almost indiscriminate devastation with fire and sword, it is necessary to gather from relic, tomb, and chronicle, what may be known of the Anglo-Saxon religious beliefs, customs, and social organisation. Of the numerous Saxon remains in their tombs and barrows in this country, most go to prove, as Professor Rolleston \* says, "their great aptness for destroying," and "their great slowness in elaborating material civilisation"; nor can we wonder at this when it is considered that though a people of marked agricultural tendencies, their herds and flocks found a sparse pasturage among the heather-covered sand dunes of their homes in Sleswick, the mouths of the Rhine, and Holland. A life of warfare and hardship was the condition of existence on lands barely above the level of the tides of the North Sea, and undoubtedly this inured them to an element which afforded their adventurous spirits at very early times an opportunity of piracy and depredation. No coast in Europe appears to have been safe from their marauding incursions; no estuary but was known to their *cyulas* (keels). In the Song of Beowulf, and in the Exeter Book, the fleets of long galleys are described, swan-necked, or with prows resembling dragons, sailing or rowing towards the shining cliffs and headlands of Britain. "The warden of the shore stands with his rustic guard to prevent the landing of the corsairs; as the ships are beached, the shields are lifted from the gunwale, and the raven flag is raised that betokens the presence of the war-god; the pirates charge on with their brown shining swords and long rough-handled spears, and over the face the likeness of a boar hardened in the fire to keep the life in safety." Sidonius saw such crews on his visit

P. H. NEWMAN.  
Social Life and  
Manners.

The Fleets of the  
Invaders.

\* See his contributions to the "Archæologia," and appendix to Canon Greenwell's "British Barrows."

1066]

to King Euric at Bordeaux, and his letter contains bright descriptions of the Saxons with blue paint on their cheeks, and their hair pushed back to the crown to make the forehead seem larger. The masters of the sea appeared shy and awkward among the hosts of courtiers who were devouring the wealth of Aquitaine; but when they were once on their clumsy galleys, all was turbulence and freedom again. One would think, said the Bishop, that each oarsman was the arch-pirate himself, for they are all ordering and obeying, and teaching and learning at once." The ships were like the half-decked crafts which were used by the later Vikings, in which rowers sat on each side of a long gangway, the best of the fighting men being posted in the forecastle or round the chieftains on the quarter-deck. In a description of a sea fight in the north (which belongs, it must be allowed, to a much later period) we read how a king steered till the action began, and then sat on deck in his scarlet cloak, and when the swords became notched and blunted he went down to the forehold, and opened the chests under the throne, and took out many sharp swords, and handed them to his men.\*

That such were the fleets which harried the coast as early as the third century A.D. we have a visible proof in the vessel dug up in a peat bog in Sleswick, together with Roman weapons and coins of dates from A.D. 67 to A.D. 217. This craft, built of boards of oak, is seventy feet long by nine broad; the stem and stern are alike in shape, and fashioned so that the vessel might be safely beached on a foreshore. Sculptured stones have been found also, representing such ships under way, where they are shown as propelled by twelve pairs of oars, and have a coxswain, probably the leader of the expedition. These boats could carry about 120 warriors.

It is often argued, with no little reason, that this spirit of maritime adventure is the true origin of that naval supremacy England has held in later times; if this be so, it seems the more remarkable that no sooner had the English settled in Britain than they gave up seafaring entirely, their vessels rotted or were destroyed, and no more were built. Bishop Wilfrith, much later, is said to have had to teach the South Saxons how to fish, and we know

\* Elton's "Origins of English History."



that up to the time of Alfred the English had no vessels to cope with those of the Danish corsairs. Finding the fertile vales of Britain even at that time in a far higher state of cultivation than the Saxon and Sleswick flats, the invaders immediately took to grazing and agriculture, under far more favourable conditions than had been possible on the Continent. The towns appear to have been neglected when not destroyed, and were thinly inhabited by a mixed population—the

**The Method of the  
Settlement.**

English conquerors living in the country, building villages, and portioning out the land according to their own national customs and practices. The Roman villas were mostly burnt, the inhabitants driven out, if not killed, and the serfs transferred to Teuton masters. The forest mark or the fen divided village from village and clan from clan; clearings were fenced and cultivated. Communities or families of Saxons bearing one name were frequent, and this name as frequently distinguished the village; and we are compelled to infer by the derivations of names of villages and places now existing that the population must have been very considerable. One reason why the Anglo-Saxons destroyed so many villas and built their own houses was probably a superstitious dread of living in houses built by other people, and a fear of magical influences. Even the king's or chief's palace was nothing more than a long wooden hall, which, with its outhouses, was roughly stockaded, like the villages. No stone buildings were used in the earlier times; the temples or buildings for religious services were of wood; for State ceremonies and meetings none were used; the folk-moot, judicial proceedings, and the election of the kings, took place in the open air, as customary with many northern peoples.

**Trade.**

Cattle and slaves were the usual medium of exchange or barter among the Anglo-Saxons. A father, if poor, indeed, had the right of selling his children, even so late as the time of the Norman Conquest, for seven years, though a restriction involving the consent of the child was brought about by the clergy in the middle of the seventh century. Cattle seem to have been a sort of type of barter, as we find them stamped upon the early coins, and *pecus*—cattle—is the origin of the word *pecunia*. As the Saxons very soon settled down to the cultivation of the soil and

1088]

pastoral pursuits—though much interrupted by their constant warfare—the Chronicles and MSS. give us a fairly good insight into their general habits and customs in relation to the soil. Thus boundaries of property are defined by hedges, streams, and other marks; enclosures and gates are spoken of, and trees are valued by the number of swine they could shelter. The laws protected timber and growing trees, regulations were made, and a *wite*, or penalty, was exacted for cutting down for fuel or other uses. Cattle were abundant, and not very valuable because of the cheapness of land: an acre appears often to have been sold for the price of four sheep, the average price of a sheep being about four shillings. A cow was six times less valuable than a horse, and an ass or mule was double the price of an ox.\* The value of neat stock must have been inconsiderable when ewes, as we find, were milked to make cheese. The month of May was known as Trimilchi, for then the cattle were milked three times a day. Imperfect housing of cattle and storage of the coarse fodder led to enormous losses—sometimes a fifth of the herds—in the severe winters. The sheep was less valued for its flesh than for the clothes derived from its fleece—for which, indeed, it seems to have been principally reared, although, as we see, the milk was used.

Country Life.

The possession of swine seems to have been of great importance, judging from the vast herds the Anglo-Saxons kept at all times. Though of little value excepting for food, yet their rearing and maintenance were far more economical than that of cattle. The swine were driven into the woods and wastes, where the oak and the beech-mast provided an unlimited and fattening diet, which the animals easily found for themselves, the cares of the swineherd being confined simply to keeping the herd together, or at most to beating the oaks for acorns, as shown in an illumination in the Cottonian MSS., when the provender was not already plentifully strewn on the ground of the interminable forests. In Domesday Book pannage (swine's food) is returned for Middlesex as 16,535 hogs, in Hertfordshire as 30,705, and in Essex—a continuous forest land then—as 90,991. Wills frequently refer to swine. That of a nobleman

Swine.

\* See instances collected by Sharon Turner.

leaves two thousand swine to his two daughters; another leaves a hide of land with two hundred swine to his relations, and wills two hundred swine to two priests, in equal shares, for the welfare of his soul. Another instance occurs where a person bequeaths land to the Church conditionally on two hundred swine being fed for the behoof of his wife.

The cultivation of arable land was, as compared with later times, but little productive. Wheat and  
**Agriculture.** barley were grown in the fields nearer the dwellings than the pasture lands, and marl, which had been used as a manure under the Romans, was used by their successors; but besides that, the management of arable land was very imperfectly understood. Not a third part of the estates—sometimes but a fifth or sixth—were used in cultivation, and although the illuminated MSS. show ploughing and agricultural pursuits among many other illustrations of the manners and customs of Anglo-Saxon daily life, and we know that barley was used largely for brewing, as well as for bread, yet it would appear that the growth of live stock, the care of flocks and herds, goats, geese, and fowl, occupied the chief attention. That famines were frequent is not to be solely attributed, however, to the small proportion of land under cultivation, but to the interruptions of war, the difficulty of communication between places and settlements where roads had fallen into disrepair, and social intercourse was limited, or almost impossible. Horses do not appear to have been used in agriculture; oxen are represented attached to the ploughs and harrows, both in the MSS. and in that invaluable record of the latest Saxon times—the embroidery of Matilda, known as the Bayeux tapestry. The horse was used for food until the eighth century, but rarely afterwards, and retained chiefly for the saddle and for purposes of hunting and war.

As a whole, as Mr. Grant Allen observes:—

“The Anglo-Saxon heathendom was a religion of terrorism. Evil  
**Religious** spirits surrounded men on every side, dwelt in all  
**Survivals.** solitary places, and stalked over the land by night. Ghosts dwelt in the forest; elves haunted the rude stone circles of elder days; the woodland—still really tenanted by deer, wolves, and wild boars—was also filled in imagination by demons and imps. Charms, spells, and incantations formed the most real and living part of the national faith, and many of these survived into Christian times, as witchcraft; some of them continue in the folk-lore of the present time.”

Totemism or animal worship, common to the entire Aryan race, was evidently practised. Families believing themselves descended from some animal or plant preserved the name, as the Wylfings (sons of the wolf), Heartings (sons of the hart), and numerous other examples indicate. Fire was produced by rubbing two sticks together, as with other savage tribes, and possessed a sacred character. The "need" fire, as it was termed, was kindled once a year, and the village hearths rekindled with it; and to preserve cattle from the evil spirits they were passed through the flame. The custom of suttee was practised, widows sacrificing themselves at the death of their husbands.

Marriage ceremonies consisted in the assemblage of friends, the consuming of the great loaf (made by the bride as an introduction into house-keeping, and the ancestor of our wedding-cake); some special barrels of beer were brewed—the "bride ale," hence our modern "bridal." This beer was drunk to her health and to that of the bridegroom (originally *brydgumma*, bridesman). The Anglo-Saxons paid a regular sum, agreed upon beforehand, to the father before the wedding; the consent of the lady being obtained, the bridegroom then gave his promise and his "wed." "Nor," adds Sharon Turner, "was this promise trusted to his honour merely, or to his own interest. The female sex was so much under the protection of the law that the bridegroom was compelled to produce friends, who became security for his due observance of the covenant." In this we have the origin of "groomsman" or "best man" of our time. The parties being betrothed, the next step to take was to settle by whom the *foster-léan*, or money requisite for the care of the children, was to be supplied. The bridegroom pledged himself to do this; his friends became security for him. These preliminaries being arranged, he had to signify what he meant to give her for choosing to be his wife, and what he should give her in case she survived him. This was the *morgen gifu*, being given by the Anglo-Saxon husbands to their wives on the morning after the wedding. The old law says that it is right that she should halve the property, or the whole of it should become hers if she had children, unless she married again. The friends of the bridegroom became surety for his good conduct, and those of the bride for hers.

A priest—when Christianity was introduced—blessed the union; and after many points of law had been settled for the protection of the wife under all possible circumstances, “her relations wedded her to him.” But in all these instances no mention is made of the wedding-ring, which came later. The English, regarding the wife in her capacity of ruler of the household, placed a ring upon her finger as a badge, not of servitude, but of authority, as in the case of the consort of Ethelred the Second, who before receiving the crown was anointed and distinguished by this symbolic act of adornment.

Great respect was generally shown by the Anglo-Saxons for women. They were rarely employed in agricultural pursuits, and confined themselves usually to household occupations, while the more exalted participated in public affairs. But there is another side to the domestic picture, equally veracious, and an accompaniment of the heathenism which overran the land. Polygamy was not unknown, and the

**Polygamy and  
Exogamy.**

custom prevailed of men marrying their father's widows—an institution clearly based on the idea of inherited property. Exogamy also existed—i.e., marriage by capture outside the tribe—and the practice of counting kindred only on the female side. This, as Mr. Grant Allen points out, “is an accompaniment of the low state of culture with which totemism is usually associated. This method of reckoning relationship obtained among certain Aryan tribes such as the Picts.” To what extent Jutes, English, and Saxons intermarried is as difficult to say as how far the fact of the frequent recurrence of the clan-name in quite opposite districts tends to prove the greater probability of exogamy. In the English ceremony of marriage the bridegroom touched the head of the bride with a shoe—a relic doubtless of the ancient mode of capture, when the foot of the captor was placed on the neck of the prisoner. After marriage the wife's hair was cut short, the very general indication of slavery. These marriage customs, as well as other institutions connected with the religion of the Anglo-Saxon invaders, indicate an imaginative but barbaric superstition, having for its origin, severally, a primitive and savage totemism, the Nature worship common to the Aryan peoples, the ancestor or hero worship of the Teutons, and the exaltation

1086]

—if not deification—of War, Fate, Victory, and Death. While it would seem that a love of adventure and warfare hindered, if it accompanied, an instinct for the cultivation of the soil and the accumulation of flocks and herds, it seems equally certain that the dwellers in such an unsettled community lived in the constant contemplation of the possibility of a violent death. Under such conditions as the foregoing, social life, beyond the limits of the clan or family, can scarcely be said to have any existence at all, most of the arts and amenities of life being dwarfed and fettered unless they have the sense of security afforded by peace. This, in a measure, was to come, however, to the Anglo-Saxons by the re-establishment of the Christian religion they had done so much to eradicate. Now, although Christianity in its refuge amongst the Irish and Welsh in the north-west was cut off from the followers of the faith on the Continent, as we have seen, by a belt of Jutes, English, and Saxons, we find the British Church established in the island of Iona by the Irish missionary, St. Columba, at the end of the sixth century, and to him **The Conversion of England.** and St. Kentigern is attributed much of the evangelising of the Picts and Strathclyde. Subsequently the missionaries of this British Church have mainly to do with the conversion of the Middle English. According to the history derived from Bede, seven of the Saxon kings held a supremacy successively over the others; the third of these, holding the title of Bretwalda, was Ethelbert, king of Kent. To him and to his consort Bertha, daughter of Caribert, king of Paris, must be given the credit of favourably receiving St. Augustine and his forty monks, sent to convert the English by Pope Gregory in 597. Bertha was a Christian, and, besides having a direct influence as queen-consort, the privilege of following her own religion had been reserved to her at her marriage. Whatever her influence on the king may have been, it greatly facilitated the work of the Roman envoy, who began under fortunate auspices the conversion of the southern Anglo-Saxons. One of the first beneficial effects of Christianity arose from the very general custom, as it appears, on the part of the converted kings of founding monasteries—institutions which, until their destruction in the time of Henry VIII., affected England in many important ways. Certainly at this

Early Saxon time they were the means of preserving to our use all the most precious treasures of literature, art, and religion in this country. These, it is to be feared, must have otherwise perished utterly in a prevailing heathendom, or in the desperate struggle of Saxon and Dane. Not only are the records of learning preserved to us in the patient translations and pencillings of Saxon and Latin monks, but with this wisdom of past ages much also is preserved to us of contemporary history, laws, manners, and customs, which have had a great and powerful influence on the social life of to-day. A century or so more of the black darkness of Anglo-Saxon heathenism and strife, and nothing would have been left of the ruins of the past for the constitution of the present. It was the gradual spread of the religion of Christ, and the growth of the "religious houses" at this period, that spared the inhabitants of these islands the Sisyphean task of again toiling up the steep of time from a lower stage of moral, intellectual, and social culture than they had probably attained at the time of the Roman invasion. That some corruption crept into the monasteries there is no doubt; but even were we compelled to believe that they were at certain periods sinks of iniquity, as some have ventured to describe them, this could not have been always the case. That the evils were great should not excite our wonder so much as that they were not greater, considering the times in which these institutions were founded and the elements of which they were composed—the times, those of newly-found religious fervour; the elements, men tired of perpetual warfare, who momentarily and vainly supposed that a life of restraint and comparative inactivity would not pall upon natures and tastes that had known no limits but the individual will. That such men, to whom a life of abnegation and self-control had scarcely shaped itself as a tradition, should leave in all cases an unsullied record could scarcely have been expected, and would have impressed us as miraculous had it been realised. Taking them at their very worst, however, it must be allowed that the monks of Early England served a useful purpose in keeping the framework of civilisation and society together, which it is far easier to-day for us to undervalue than to overestimate. The social life of England really commences here, at the threshold of the monasteries, where hospitality was



extended to all comers. Here the stranger was sure to be taken in and fed and warmed, here the sick were tended, and occupations found for those whose means of existence had been lost in a wreck Monastic Life. of war and devastation. Hope dawned again upon a darkened and war-worn land, and although the growing Church had many checks, Pendas and Cadwallas were numerous and unrelenting. Northumbria, like many another land, was lost and won again, even after Edwine's Witena-gemot on the banks of Derwent the day Coifi, the high priest of the heathen temple, decided the hesitating king by himself being the first to hurl a lance in derision at the old gods. Conversion to Christianity went steadily forward, stately minsters and abbeys were gradually raised, often on the sites of earlier wooden churches. Canterbury and York, Peterborough and Ely, Beverley, Winchester, Whitby, and Lindisfarne, with many another, looked over hill and dale, river and fen, their towers signifying landmarks and light in a material and spiritual wilderness, while choir and bell and sacred chant banished the elfin brood of heathen imagination. New clearings in the woods were made; lands were, as in Roman times, reclaimed; and roads made across hitherto impassable morasses and trackless forests, as men's minds were opened out to the light of culture. Writing began to take the place of the Runic character, the Roman alphabet to supersede the forty rude Futhork symbols, and the roughly-carved wooden staff or *bok* to make way for the vellum manuscript with its illuminations and its seals. The sons of the men who, failing to find heroic death in battle, let out their life-blood by carving with their spear-points the name of Odin in runes upon their breasts, died now peaceably in their beds in the faith of Christ, whose Gospels had been translated and embellished on parchment by the monks.

But although Christianity steadily gained ground—in spite of wars and Danish invasion—its tenets were not accepted to the total exclusion of the heathen superstition and beliefs. Accordingly we find laws being made to suppress, if not the beliefs, the practices they preserved or engendered, such as incantations, fountain worship, etc.; but much of our folk-lore of the present day preserves traces of the Anglo-Saxon and Danish heathendom.

Before the conversion we have no written records or chronicles, but now the laws and customs **The Unification of English Life.** began to be inscribed and codified; added to these, the grants of lands to the monasteries, and their voluminous charters which have been handed down to us, afford a most valuable insight into general and social history. Ecclesiastical organisation was speedily commenced in each kingdom, and although the Church of Iona, jealous of its teaching and tenets, even to the Irish priests claiming the adoption of the crescent tonsure on the authority of St. John, in opposition to the circular tonsure on the authority of St. Peter, adopted by the Roman priesthood—this and other hindrances only stayed uniformity for a time. King Oswy, a very practical convert, decided in favour of the saint whom he was taught to believe carried the keys of heaven, and the Irish priests withdrew or acquiesced. Also we find that the irregular monasteries, and mixed communities of monks and nuns under one abbot or abbess, gave way in time to the establishment of the severer Benedictine rule enforced by the Roman bishops; but it was reserved for St. Dunstan at a later time, when the spirit of monasticism was waning and the country was oppressed by the Danish inroads and destruction, to revive and reorganise these centres of learning and civilisation, and by the enforcement of the celibacy of the clergy to give the Roman Church that culminating characteristic which, whether conceived by its originators in the spirit of piety or of policy, has really proved a serious stumbling-block in the path of the Papacy in England, besides during its domination being very prejudicial to the social advancement of the people. Dunstan, born in Celtic Somersetshire, recluse, and Abbot of Glastonbury, was a most remarkable man for his time, combining as he did under the rigorous rule of an ascetic life the faculties that made him a skilled mechanic and artificer, jeweller, painter, and musician, added to a statesmanship that, finding in these troublous times full opportunity and channels for its exercise, moulded the country into a rough unity, and bent King Eadgar and the nobles to his sturdy will. That this will, however, carried him occasionally to extreme lengths, equally beyond any consideration of his own personal safety or any feeling for others, is shown in his brutal

1066]

support of Odo, his predecessor in the See of Canterbury, when that primate divorced Edwin from the beautiful Elfgiva, and also—though here we have to trust very slight evidence—in the relentless persecution of the married clergy.

The kings, we find, were elective—or perhaps selective is the better term; the choice by the people of a king as one of themselves, if not falling for some reason on the eldest son (as in the case of minors), was limited usually to one family. The king's prerogatives were considerable: he had command of the armies, the guardianship of the coinage, and the power of summoning the Witan, the great council, and they with him framed the laws. It is worthy of remark that his word was taken without oath. This is curiously reflected in many of the laws referring to witnesses. An instance occurs in the time of Edward the Elder (A.D. 901-924).\* The law runs thus:—Cap. I. "Of Cheapening. And I will that every man have his warrantor, and that no man buy out of port, but have the port reeve's witness, or that of other unlying men (*ungeligenna manna*) whom one may believe, etc." Another law referring to Sundays is also interesting:—V. Witan of 1008: "Let Sunday's festival be rightly kept, and let marketings and folk-motes be carefully abstained from on that holy day." The fact that the chapman who could not bring his witnesses was considered little better than a thief is of a piece with the gradual development of the system of frank-pledge, or bail security, the law supposing the accused guilty until proved innocent.

Wessex clearly had considerable intercourse with the Roman world while trading vessels were in the habit of coming constantly up the Thames to London. The laws relating to customs and port-reeves extant show an early import market, which probably comprised gold, silver, precious stones, silks, furs, wines, oils, spices, drugs, and cloth. Slaves in early times were exported to Africa, Spain, and Ireland, also wool, hides, and the celebrated English gold work; and embroidery needlework was much practised by the Saxon women in all important households.

\* Cited in the Report of the Royal Commission on Market Rights and Tolls, vol. I., 1889.

The dress of the women consisted of a kirtle to the knee, of various colours, worn over a longer tunic of linen. The *gunna*, or gown, was worn very long for hunting; their mantles were long and short, the short mantle for hunting and the use of the bow. All the ladies had their necks, from the chin, closely wrapped (in a wimple), and in none of them was any attempt made to display a fine waist, nor had their heads any other covering than their hoods. The ordinary attire of men was a plain tunic reaching the knees; it was fastened by a girdle at the waist; a short cloak was worn, sometimes stockings, but always shoes, even amongst the labouring classes. The beard was allowed to grow long, often divided; but with the adoption of Norman fashions in the time of Harold II. they shaved the face. The garments of both sexes were of silk, linen, woollen, and some parts of the men's attire of leather; red, blue, and green were the favourite colours; jewellery and ornaments were worn. These have a distinctive character, agreeing in taste and feeling with the architectural carving and painting, which latter was, however, chiefly confined to missals.

The ornaments worn by Saxon men consisted of brooches, bracelets, and fibulæ of gold, silver, and ivory. Chains, crosses, and rings of gold and silver, studded with jewels, and headbands or diadems ornamented with precious stones, occur in the MSS. illuminations. The passion for long, flowing hair and ringlets was never overcome, although denounced by the clergy. Long hair and forked beards may be said to be Saxon characteristics. The custom of tattooing or puncturing the skin was continued as a relic of barbarism throughout the whole Anglo-Saxon period more or less, and was one of the vices inveighed against by William of Malmesbury after the Norman Conquest. We may presume that the Saxon women wore the socca, or some other sort of hose, as well as men, but the length of the tunics in the illuminations prevents this being verified. Although the head-rail or band was universally worn, the Anglo-Saxon women devoted much attention to dressing their hair. Aldhelm mentions the twisted locks of a lady as being delicately curled by an iron; and Judith, in the Anglo-Saxon poem called by that name, is apostrophised as the "maid of

1066]

the Creator with twisted locks." Aldhelm describes also the wife as loving to paint her cheeks with the red of stibium. Anglo-Saxon wills and documents mention cuffs and ribands, bracelets, a gold fly adorned with gems, golden vermiculated necklaces, golden head-bands, earrings, a neck-cross, and golden ornaments called *sylas*. Gloves are very rare, and in the one instance observable in the illuminations have a thumb only and not the fingers divided; the hands are generally, when covered, disposed in the folds of the mantle or long sleeves.

A few national peculiarities alone serve to distinguish the costume of the Danes during the ninth and tenth centuries from that of the Anglo-Saxons. At one time, according to Arnold of Lubeck, they wore the dress of sailors, as befitted Vikings and men who obtained their living by adventure at sea; but on their settling in England they adopted a gayer costume, combing their long hair—of which they seem to have been very proud—once a day, bathing once a week, and often changing their attire to please the eyes of the women. The *Knytlinga Saga* describes Canute's hair as profuse, but he appears to have worn the regal Saxon costume, only varied by the mantle being fastened by cords and tassel instead of a fibula or ring. The massive gold bracelets of the Danes were always buried with them. The Danes were generally more heavily armed than the Saxons, and were taught to shoot well with the bow. They carried moon-shaped shields, painted red usually, and attained terrible celebrity in wielding their favourite weapon, the Danish axe.

Besides those used for clothes, textile fabrics were made and used for the furnishing and adornment of the Anglo-Saxon houses. Hangings Furniture. were indeed a necessity, to exclude the frequent draughts, from imperfect construction in their buildings. Alfred, for the same reason, used lanterns to protect the lights with which he measured the time. Some of the curtain stuffs are richly embroidered and worked upon with animals and birds in gold and other material. Ancient wills refer to Anglo-Saxon bed-clothes (*beddrease*). One bequeaths with a curtain (*hryste*) and sheet all that thereto belongs. To his son he gives the *beddrease* and all the clothes that appertain to it. A lady also bequeaths two chests and contents, bed-curtains;

also a red tent and pillow of straw is willed. A goat-skin bed-covering is sent to an Anglo-Saxon abbot. In Judith we read of the gilded fly-net hung about the leader's bed, and bear-skins are sometimes mentioned as forming part of bed-furniture. There is a drawing of a Saxon bed and curtain in MSS., Claudius B. 4, which may be seen in Strutt, *Horda Angel*, pl. xiii., fig. 2, in which the head and bottom of the bed seem to be both boarded, and the pillows look as though made of plaited straw. Not to go to bed was occasionally enjoined as a penance—when the sin was expiated by lying on the floor. For their food and conviviality the wealthy used many costly articles. We perpetually hear of silver cups sometimes silver-gilt. Cups were often given by will. Wynfleda gives, besides four silver cups, a cup with a fringed edge, a wooden cup variegated with gold, a wooden-knob bed cup, and two very handsome drinking-cups. Dishes of gold are mentioned, and one of Greek workmanship. Two silver basins are given by a lady to a monastery. A king in 833 gives his gilt cup, engraved without with vine dressers fighting dragons, which he called his cross-bowl, because of a cross marked within it, and it had four angels projecting like a similar figure. At other times we meet with cups of bone. The less wealthy classes of necessity had not these valuable articles, but used vessels of wood and horn; but a Council ordained that such should not be used in the sacred edifices, though the curiously carved horn, which was made in Anglo-Saxon times, is still preserved in York Cathedral. Glass vessels were little used. A disciple of Bede asked Lullus in France if any man in his parish who could make glass vessels might be persuaded to come and settle in England, for, adds he, "we are ignorant and helpless in the art."

Gold and silver seem to have been applied to all purposes—personal ornaments and garments, saddles, sword hilts, bridles, and even furniture, as tables are mentioned made or adorned with the precious metals. The crown of the Anglo-Saxon king is described by the contemporary biographer of Dunstan as made of gold and silver, and set with various gems, with most of which the Anglo-Saxons appear to have been familiar.

The furniture of a Saxon house was rude and simple in construction, though often of costly materials; draughts were

1086]

prevented in the abodes of the wealthy by the use of tapestry, building in all cases being extremely rough; stone structures were rare; houses most commonly consisted of one room, in the midst of which the fire was lighted, the smoke finding its way out through the centre of the thatched roof.

The Anglo-Saxon kings seem to have been great lovers of the chase. Boars and wild deer were the principal objects of pursuit, but they also hunted hares and goats. Nets were used, as well as trained dogs. Horns were used, and were very necessary in the deep forests. The laws controlling hunting were, as is well known much milder than those of Norman times. Canute abolished hunting on Sundays. Hawking was a very favourite pastime, and Alfred the Great did not disdain to write a book upon it and the management of hawks. Bows and arrows, as well as slings, appear in the illustrations of the chase. Although there is no absolute account of horse-racing, Bede describes a party of young men trying the speed of their horses on an open piece of ground.

**Amusements.**

Indoor sports varied with the different ranks of society. Canute is mentioned as being on one occasion engaged in a game of tesseræ or scacci. Games similar to chess and backgammon were known. The clergy were forbidden games of chance by the canons of Edgar. Gleemen, who throughout mediæval times played an important part at all festivals, were constantly mentioned at the Anglo-Saxon period. These, besides being musicians and singers, were generally buffoons, performers of tricks, dancers, tumblers, and mimics; these people no doubt initiated the earlier forms of the drama. The MSS. give frequent representations. One illustration shows Herodias dancing before Herod, where she is exhibited as tumbling. Gleemen are also shown throwing up and catching balls and knives. Animals were taught to perform and dance. Exercises of strength were popular. St. Cuthbert, as recorded by Bede, excelled in wrestling, running, and other athletic feats. Bear-baiting also afforded amusement to the multitude.

The peasant in the earlier times not only baked his own barley bread in ovens, or on iron plates, but ground the flour in hand-mills; water-mills and wind-mills were adopted in later times. Bakers,

**Foods.**



however, were common in the towns, and there are instances where bread was accepted as rent for land. The monasteries were sometimes so poor as not to be able to afford barley bread; salt, beans, and honey are mentioned, the latter taking the place of sugar, which was unknown at this period. Fish, eggs, butter, cheese, beans, and herbs, with meat, formed the dietary of children. The spices of the East were not unknown, though necessarily scarce; they are mentioned as presents amongst wealthy persons. Thus we read that Boniface sent an abbess a little frankincense, pepper, and cinnamon; and he received from an archdeacon cinnamon, pepper, and costus, then a favourite condiment.

Food was salted for the winter, when the cattle were imperfectly fed and in want of pasture to fatten them; so we find salt manufactured by a special class of persons, and evidently an important product; grants and conveyances refer to it and to the implements and utensils used in boiling. Fishing was an important calling, especially after the seventh century; rod, line, and net were used. Serfs were transferred with the fishery as fishermen in the meres and brooks of the undrained lands. Boats were fitted out for sea-fishing, but the produce necessarily did not come far inland, where conveyance was limited.

Barley- and oaten-bread was the chief food of the humble classes, but most edible meats and fish were generally eaten; eels were eaten as freely as swine's flesh. Wine was drunk, and a morat made from honey and the juice of the mulberry; piments (*see* p. 470) were made of wine, honey, and spices; the people also indulged freely in ale. Excessive drinking could not have been looked on as a vice by a people who had once regarded it in the light of a religious ceremony.

Wine, though made, was little drunk; wine-presses are shown in the illuminations, but the climate must have restricted the growth of the grape to the southern portion of the island. At all events, mead and ale were the popular beverages, and alehouses were common; we find that priests were forbidden to frequent the wine tuns. The wealthy classes seem to have taken four meals a day. That animal food was largely used is evidenced by a law of Wihtred, which says that a man who gave meat to his servants on fast days

1066]

was liable to be punished by the pillory.\* If the servant ate it of his own accord he was either fined or bound "to suffer in his hide" (Wilk. Leg. Sax. 97). Boiling, baking, and broiling were the usual processes of cooking animal food, the former perhaps the most common. The principal vegetable in use was cabbage. The monasteries possessed cooks, but female slaves performed the duties in ordinary households. An instance occurs of a lady bequeathing her cook.

The arms of the Saxons were long broadswords and short daggers, and they carried circular shields of hide rimmed with metal. Helms were frequently of leather on metal framework. Ring mail was also used as a protection, and archery was practised, but not with the long-bow of the later English.

The Anglo-Saxons used the luxury of hot baths. These seem to have been common, for a nun is mentioned who, as an act of voluntary Baths. mortification, washed in them only on festivals. Not to go to warm baths and to abstain from a soft bed was part of a severe penance. The general practice of these baths is shown from its being urged by the canons as a charitable duty to give to the poor meat, fire, fodder, bed, bathing, and clothes. Cold bathing, however, was little valued, except as a penitential exercise. Washing the feet in warm water, especially after travelling, is often mentioned as a part of indispensable hospitality, and leads us to suppose, as Sharon Turner remarks, "that shoes and stockings, though worn in social life, were little used in travelling." It is not an improbable inference also that the custom of warm bathing arose not in their own country, but after contact with the Romanised and luxurious Britons, whose villas would contain many of the necessary appliances, and which were certainly not to be looked for on the flats of Sleswick. As to washing the feet, independently of the necessity occurring from the practice of travelling barefoot, even so lately followed in the north as the beginning of this century, washing the feet of the poor was always inculcated by the Church as a religious exercise in the rich.

\* Milk, cheese, and eggs were allowed on fast days.

The dead appear to have been buried and not burnt—  
 unless in pre-Christian times. The coffins  
 of the poor were of wood, the wealthier  
 of stone. Cuthbert, eleventh bishop from St. Augustine,  
 obtained leave to make cemeteries\*—a healthier practice than  
 that obtaining later of burying the dead in churches. The  
*saul sceat*, or payment of the clergy at death, became a very  
 general practice. Sharon Turner says, "No respectable person  
 died or was buried without a handsome present to the  
 ecclesiastical establishment." Wynflæda, for her *saul sceat*,  
 gave to every one of the religious, at the place she mentions,  
 a mancus of gold, and to another place half-a-pound's worth.  
 She adds a direction to her children that they will illuminate  
 for her soul.†

Ethelflæda, at her death, said to Dunstan, "Do thou  
 early in the morning cause the baths to be hastened, and  
 the funeral vestments to be prepared which I am about to  
 wear, and after the washing of my body I will celebrate the  
 mass and receive the sacraments, and in that manner I will  
 die." In regard to burial in the churches, before the con-  
 struction of the cemeteries, only ecclesiastics or those known  
 to have practised a holy life were allowed the privilege.

The Danes only occupied England under their sovereigns  
 for a comparatively short time, and certainly  
 Canute contributed not a little in the general  
 observance of the existing customs, although  
 we occasionally find some of the laws rather more stringent  
 than formerly—at any rate, England may be considered to  
 have continued in general if gradual progress, religiously and,  
 of course, socially; but it must be observed that this progress  
 was rather from what the Anglo-Saxon acquired here than  
 from what he brought from the Continent.

\* Dugdale, *Monasticon* I., 25.

† Sharon Turner, Bk. VII., c. 14

## AUTHORITIES.

### (a) GENERAL HISTORY.

*Authorities.*—Ammianus Marcellinus, a Greek soldier in the Roman forces,  
 writing in the fourth century, continued the histories of Tacitus from Nerva to  
 Valens. Ausonius and Claudian, Latin poets, also of the fourth century, allude to  
 Britain. Prosper of Aquitaine in the fifth century continued the *Annals of St.*

1086]

*Jerome* to A. D. 445; *Sidonius Apollinaris*, Bp. of Clermont, describes the Saxon pirates; *Zozimos*, the historian, notices the events of his time in Britain. *Mero-baudes*, a Frank, wrote a poem on *Aëtius'* third consulship. In the sixth century the princely *Saint Gildas* wrote his *Epistle to the Kings and Priests of Britain*. In the eighth century *Nennius* wrote a history of the Britons from tradition, to which *Marcus* added in the ninth, and *Bede* (*Boeda*), a priest of Jarrow, wrote a history of the Christian Church in England. This was put into English by the order of King *Alfred*, who also probably had the Anglo-Saxon or English Chronicle compiled and placed at Winchester. *Henry of Huntingdon*, *Florence of Worcester*, *Simeon of Durham*, and other Latin-writing chroniclers after the Conquest, and the French chroniclers *Wace* and *Gaimar*, also deal with these times, sometimes adding matter drawn from poems and traditions to the facts obtained from the English Chronicle. In the eleventh century *Ethelward*, an English nobleman, epitomised the original Chronicle for his cousin, a German princess. The Irish and Welsh Chronicles (sometimes contemporary) give a better chronology than the English Chronicle. The lives of various saints (British, Irish, and English) add much to our knowledge of the life and beliefs of these early times. The best edition of *Bede* is that by *Lumby and Mayor* (good notes), of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, that by *Plummer*.

*Modern Books*.—*Sharon Turner's History of the Anglo-Saxons* (contains the best life yet written of *Alfred*); *Stubbs' Constitutional History*, Vol. I.; *Freeman's Old English History and Norman Conquest*, Vol. I. For Scotch history the works of *Skene* and *Robertson* are all-important. The *Annals of England* (*Oxford, Parker*) contain a useful chronology. *Grant Allen's Anglo-Saxon Britain* (S.P.C.K.) is a valuable popular sketch.

#### (b) SPECIAL SUBJECTS.

*Religion: Paganism*.—*Grimm, Deutsche Mythologie*, translated by *J. S. Stally-brass*, 4 vols., London, 1880-88; *Rydberg, Teutonic Mythology*, translated by *R. B. Anderson*, London, 1889; *Kemble, The Saxons in England*, Vol. I. (new edition), London, 1876; and for the etymology of local names, *Isaac Taylor, Words and Places*, cap. xiii., compressed edition, London, 1873.

*English Church History to Norman Conquest*.—A. *Original Authorities*.—To 730 the primary authority is *Bede, Historia Ecclesiastica*, and some other writings. (Best edition, *Moberly's*: Clarendon Press.) Next to *Bede* in value, though four centuries later, is *William of Malmesbury, de Gestis Pontificum* (*Rolls' Series*), for the whole period. The *Old English Chronicles*, the great contemporary authority for this period, are not primarily ecclesiastical. The laws, canons, penitentials, and other documents in the great collection of *Haddan and Stubbs*, Vol. III., are most important. Among biographies the lives of *Wilfred* by *Eddius* (*Migne*), of *Cuthbert* by *Bede*, of *Aldhelm* by *Faricius* (*Migne*), of *Alfred* by *Asser*, two of *Dunstan* (*Rolls' Series*), one of *Edward the Confessor* (*Rolls' Series*) are of considerable value. The letters of *Aldhelm* and *Alcuin* are important. The authorities for the history of the Celtic Churches are scanty and difficult. The contemporary documents are in *Haddan and Stubbs*. The most important materials for the life of *St. Patrick* are collected in the edition of the *Vita Tripartita*, edited by *Whitley Stokes* (*Rolls' Series*). *Reeves' edition of Adamnan's Life of St. Columba* is a storehouse of learning.

B. *Modern Writers*.—*Bright's Early English Church History* is for the period covered by *Bede* only. Chapter viii. in *Stubbs' Constitutional History*, the same author's introduction to the lives of *St. Dunstan* (*Rolls' Series*), and some articles in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, are invaluable. For the Celtic Churches *Todd's Life of St. Patrick*, and Vol. II. of *Skene's Celtic Scotland* are excellent.

*Law*.—The best edition of the Anglo-Saxon laws is *Schmid, Gesetze der Angelsachsen*. The land-books were edited by *Kemble* in his *Codex Diplomaticus*, and

more recently by Mr. Birch. The best modern work on Anglo-Saxon law is contained in articles by Konrad Maurer in the early volumes of the *Kritische Ueberschau* (Munich), and the *Essays in Anglo-Saxon Law*, by four American writers (Little, Brown & Co., Boston; and Macmillan). Many general histories of Germanic law, especially those by Brunner and Schröder, contain much about the Anglo-Saxon law that is of high value.

*Trade and Industry.*—The social and industrial life of the Anglo-Saxon period must be gleaned from scattered references in Bede (*Ecclesiastical History and Life of St. Cuthbert*) and the Lives of the saints—especially of Wilfrid, Dunstan, and Wulfstan—or from the *Codex Diplomaticus*, *The Anglo-Saxon law and Domesday Book*, and the *Dialogues of Ælfric*. Much may be gathered also from the illustrations preserved in contemporary MSS. Of modern English works the most useful are Kemble's *Saxons in England*, Sharon Turner (*see above*), Stubbs' *Constitutional History* (I. c. iv.-ix.), Green's *Conquest of England*, Ashley's *Introduction to Economic History*, Cunningham's *British Industry and Commerce*, Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce*.

*Public Health.*—There are a few meagre references to pestilences, murrains, etc., in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The Great Plague of 664 and following years is several times mentioned in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, in the lives of St. Adda and St. Cuthbert, and in the history of the abbots of Jarrow (Bede's works, edited for the English Historical Society).

*Literature.*—Ten Brink (Bernhard), *Geschichte der englischen Literatur*. Berlin, 1877. Band I.—Wülker (Dr. Richard), *Grundriss zur Geschichte der angelsächsischen Literatur*. Leipzig, 1885.—Ten Brink (Bernhard), *Beowulf-Untersuchungen: Quellen und Forschungen*, etc. Heft 62, Strassburg, 1888.—Möller (H.), *Das altenglische Volksepos in der ursprünglichen strophischen Form*. Kiel, 1883.—Heinzel (R.), *Ueber den Stil der altgermanischen Poesie: Quellen und Forschungen*. Heft 10. Strassburg, 1874.—Bode (W.), *Die Kenningar in der angelsächsischen Dichtung*. Darmstadt und Leipzig, 1886.—Bugge (E. S.), *Studien über die Entstehung der nordischen Götter und Heldensagen*. München, 1889.—Wülker (Richard), *Ueber den Dichter Cynewulf: Anglia*, Bd. I., S. 483-507. 1878.—Ten Brink (Bernhard), *Besprechung von Zupitza's Ausgabe der Elene in Haupt's Zeitschrift*. Bd. 24 (N. Folge 11), *Anzeige* S. 53-70. 1879.—Ten Brink (Bernhard), *Early English Literature*. Appendices. New York, 1883.—Rieger (Max), *Ueber Cynewulf: Zacher's Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*. Bd. I., S. 215-226 und 313-334. Halle, 1869.—Sievers (Eduard), *Der Heliand und die angelsächsische Genesis*. Halle a.S., 1875.—Earle (Prof. John), *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*. Oxford, 1865.—Foster (T. Gregory), *Judith: Studies in Metre, Language, etc.* Quellen und Forschungen. Heft 91. Strassburg, 1892.—Gollancz (I.), *Cynewulf's Christ*, edited with a modern rendering. London: David Nutt, 1892.

*Architecture, Art, Numismatics, etc.*—C. Roach Smith's *Collectanea Antiqua*, also ed. by Plummer; Sharon Turner's *History of England*; Kemble's *Saxons in England*; Willis's *Canterbury* (coins); Ruding's *Annals of the Coinage of Great Britain*, Akerman's *Manual*; Hawkins' *Silver Coins of England*.

*Social Life.*—*Encomium Emmae*, ed. Pertz; *Life of Dunstan* (ed. Stubbs); *Lives of Edward the Confessor* (ed. Ward), both in Rolls' Series; Wright, *Vocabularies* (contains Ælfric's dialogue); Wright-Wülcker, *Vocabularies* (some of these are illustrative of the social life); *The Exeter Book*, ed. Gollancz, Early English Text Society; *Beowulf*, ed. Holder (a cheap, good edition of text); Asser, *Vita Ælfredi* (a translation in Bohn's series); Earle and Plummer, *Saxonic Charters*. The poetry is full of suggestive detail.

## CHAPTER III.

FROM THE CONQUEST TO THE CHARTER. 1066-1216.

THE most striking feature in the history of the land which William of Normandy claimed and won had been the disunion between its rival tribes. This fact, while it decided the immediate victory for him, yet cost him a five years' struggle against rebellions before his conquest was final and complete.

A. L. SMITH.  
The Norman  
Conquest.

The north had hardly stirred to succour the West Saxon king on his hurried march from Stamford Bridge to Hastings; but the north was slow to bow to a rule that was more than ever a rule by Wessex over Anglian and Danish districts. England, indeed, which had seemed won at a blow, required to be subdued piecemeal. At one time it appeared as if the great battle had overthrown the champion of Southern England at the hand of the Norman Duke, only that the Norman might in turn fall at the hand of the Dane.

But Senlac was more than a great military victory; it was a social and moral victory too. Not merely did the English axe and javelin there go down before the Norman sword and bow, the too scanty house-carles and the untrained churls of Harold's following before the disciplined knights and heavy-armed footmen of Northern France, but on that field English kingship and English institutions had no spell to withstand the finer temper of the Norman spirit. The fates of two races hung in the balance; Anglo-Saxon civilisation had been tried, and found wanting. It was well in the end for England that the victory lay with the race which brought with it the very qualities that England yet lacked—the power of organisation, the sense of law and method, the genius for enterprise. The order and discipline of the Norman host, the story of their devout preparations on the eve of battle, their superior arms and equipment, their skilful stratagems

and obedience to one commanding will, are typical of the new forces that were to create a new England.

The slaughter at Senlac made it impossible for the south-eastern shires to prolong resistance. Dover, Canterbury, and Winchester fell into William's hands; but London was prepared to make a bold stand, till it was left helpless by the selfish desertion of Edwin and Morkere, the incapacity of Edgar the Atheling, and William's march across the Thames at Wallingford to Berkhamstead—a position from which he could bar the way of any reinforcements that might be coming to the city. Hither came many leading men of Wessex, and did him homage; and at last the Witan and the Londoners agreed to accept William, as forty-nine years before they had accepted Canute. On Christmas Day, 1066, only three months from his landing at Pevensey, William was crowned King of England at Westminster. Edgar, chosen king but never crowned, had submitted; the homage of Edwin and Morkere after the coronation seemed to guarantee Mid-England and the north; and if William's authority was but nominal in these districts, at any rate in the eastern and south-eastern shires he was able to begin at once his policy of confiscation and re-grant of lands. That his crown now appeared to him fairly secure seems to be proved by his recrossing the sea at Easter, 1067, to revisit his Duchy. But he left England in strong hands; for Kent was held by Bishop Odo to ward off any attacks from the Continent, and Herefordshire by Fitzosbern to repel the Welsh; and both Odo and Fitzosbern had Palatine powers in these their earldoms. Moreover, he took with him, for hostages and trophies, Edgar and Waltheof, Edwin and Morkere, and Archbishop Stigand.

During William's eight months' absence in Normandy the harsher side of Norman rule showed  
**Norman Rule.** itself in England. Under the oppression of Bishop Odo and Fitzosbern the men of Kent and of Herefordshire broke into revolt. But such isolated risings were futile. In vain did Kent call over Eustace of Boulogne to its aid, and Edric the Wild summon his Welsh allies to the plunder of Normans in Herefordshire. The revolts were put down, even before William could return.

The nation, which had never taught itself to act in unison,



even in the fearful days of Danish ravages, was slow to learn its lesson now. Nothing less than the heavy resistless pressure of the Norman rule, continued for more than a century, could effect this. Thus the south-west, never yet subdued by William, was in open defiance by the winter of 1067, at the same time as Yorkshire and the north, but acted in no concert with them. Exeter, where Harold's mother and sons were, offered to yield and pay taxes if it might in all other respects be independent. But the fall of Exeter and the ravaging of Dorsetshire carried the submission of Somerset, Devon and Cornwall, Worcestershire and Gloucestershire. It also put into the king's hand a fresh group of forfeited estates, wherewith to reward his kinsmen and followers. Not till the west was thus subdued, did the north rise openly. By recalling the Atheling from Scotland, the Northerners made an attempt, by a confederation with Edwin and Morkere and Edric, and aid promised from Welsh, Scots, and Danes, to set up a separate northern kingdom, and to revive a division which, alike in the days of Edwy and Edgar, of Edmund and Canute, and of Godwine and Leofric, had been a fact either avowed or latent in Anglo-Saxon policy. But no crisis could make the Mercian earls loyal allies; they made their peace once more, the revolt collapsed, and William entered York in triumph. He was now actual ruler of West Saxon, East Anglian, and most of Mercian England, with the old Deira. But even over these lands his hold was far from secure; and beyond the Tees, the Bernician districts, Durham, Northumberland, and the Lothians, were his by the tie of homage only; and Cheshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire, still held out, and were still under the influence of Edric.

Yet William appears now to have imagined the hardest part of his task to be done. He allowed many of his Norman soldiery to depart; he appointed a follower of his own to be Earl of Northumberland; the long delays of Swegen seemed to show that the danger from the Danes had passed away. The year 1069 was to bring him a rude awakening. The burghers of Durham mas-

**The Reaction  
against the  
Conqueror.**

sacred the new earl and his men; the burghers of York slew the Norman commandant of the castle; Harold's sons were attacking Devonshire, Edric laying siege

to Shrewsbury ; the Danish fleet appeared on the south and on the east coasts, finally entering the Humber, and garrisoning York. William had been called away from his vengeance on York to put down another general rising in the south-west. Now, by a hasty return march, he drove the Danes out of Lincolnshire, and again mastered York. Here by a second coronation, on Christmas Day, 1069, he made a concession to the stubborn sense of independence in the land north of Humber. But he had also been engaged meanwhile in a measure at once of vengeance and of policy, which should reduce that independence to a vain memory, and for ever put a stop to the invitation of Danish fleets. This

**The Wasting of  
the North.**

measure was the famous "Wasting of the North," the ruin and almost the depopulation of the whole of Yorkshire, a crime which shocked even that age, and one which Englishmen looked on as the chiefest of those three great sins that were to weigh heavy against his soul at the last judgment. From York William marched to Durham, and received Waltheof's submission. In February, 1070, he made his winter march from York to Chester, though the wasted land could hardly feed an army, and his starving troops mutinied on the way. With the subjugation of North-Western Mercia his conquest of England was now practically complete. The Danish fleet was bought off by bribes ; the resistance of the Fen country, centring about the Isle of Ely and the person of Hereward, was overcome in 1071, after eighteen months of toilsome siege. Edric had before this made his submission ; Edwin was dead, and Morkere was now a captive. The five years of gallant but disorganised fighting was over ; the verdict of Hastings was ratified ; a new race had become the rulers of the land, and not till the bloodless victory of Runnymede in 1215 was it clear that Norman barons had merged into the mass of the English nation. The history of these five years brings into prominence the immense superiority of the Norman mercenaries, not merely in fighting power, but in

**Effects of the  
Norman Rule.**

rapidity of movement and in unity of purpose ; in all those points, in fact, which followed from the vigilant and resolute character of their commander. Everywhere his methods are the same—to strike terror by ruthless devastation ; to secure

the towns by strong Norman garrisons and stone castles; to appoint Norman earls whom he could trust; but to win over the English by pardons and by recognition of native customs and ideas. He was anxious from the first to take up the position of a lawful English king. As early as 1070 he had dismissed most of his mercenaries; and as early as 1074 the three rebel earls found that the English had begun to look to the king as their champion against the barons. In him, too, was found as a later writer puts it, that strong man armed who guards his own house. The Welsh border from this time steadily recedes; the cruel Scotch invasions are punished by William's attack on Scotland in 1072, when Malcolm "bowed to him and became his man." Had William lived two years more, says the English Chronicle, he would have won all Ireland by his wisdom, without any fighting. The long series of Danish ravages and wars, which had hardly known ten years' cessation since 787, ended in the great preparations made by King Canute of Denmark in 1085, but rendered abortive by his murder in 1086.

Nor was the change a less marked one in England's internal condition. "The good order that King William made must not be forgotten," as the contemporary writer of the Peterborough version of the Chronicle admits: "it was such that any man who was himself aught might travel from end to end of the land unharmed; and no man durst kill another, however great the injury which he had received."

The Norman kingship was, indeed, that which the later Anglo-Saxon kingship had come not to be—a real organising power. Nowhere was the effect of the Conquest more immediately apparent than in the military system. The Bayeux tapestry shows us that to the Normans we owe both the mounted knight and the bowman, who displaced the peculiar English fashion of the two-handed axe, and the "shield-wall" of footmen. Already in Domesday Book are signs of that organisation of the feudal levy which is bound up with the definition of knight-service and the development of "knights'-fees." From the policy of William dates that increase of castles which the Crown, though only after a long struggle, kept in its own control, and the survival of that Old English array which did such yeoman service in the

conflict against feudalism. Lastly, the connection between England and Normandy kept up the importance of the south coast towns, and produced those French wars which later on led to the revival of an English navy.

THE great inquest survey, or "Description of all England," which we call Domesday Book, is one of the most precious documents that any nation possesses. It is not so old nor so minute as the wonderful French *Polyptyques*; nor is it so curious and primitive in manner and matter as the Icelandic *Landnamaboc*; but for variety of information, for excellence of plan, for the breadth of land and the space of time it covers, it is probably unrivalled. It is at once a terrier, a rent roll, an assessment register, as well as a book of settlements and a legal record. It is important alike to economist, lawyer, historian, ethnologist, and philologist. Moreover, it was composed at a period of transition and change, and enables us, better than any other writing could, to understand the manner and effects of the Norman Conquest.

The Peterborough Chronicle, written by one who knew the Conqueror, gives the best contemporary account of the place, and meaning of the survey, under the year 1083—

"After midwinter, the King let levy a great geld or tax and heavy over all England, that was on each hide two and seventy pence."

[In 1085 King Canute of Denmark, who had to wife Earl Robert's daughter of Flanders, threatened to invade the land.] "When King William of England, who was then sitting in Normandy, for he owned both England and Normandy, got news of this, he fared into England with so great an host of horsemen and footmen out of France and Brittany as never sought this land before, so that men wondered how this land might feed all that host. But the King let divide up this host over all this land among his men, and they fed the host each according to his land. . . . But when the King got news for truth that his foes were hindered, and might not carry out their journey, then he let some of his host fare to their own land, and some he held in this land the winter over. Then at midwinter the King was at Gloucester with his wise men, and held his court there five days, and afterwards the archbishop and clergy held a three days' synod. . . . After this the King took much thought and held deep speech with his Wise Men over the land, how it was settled or established, and with what kind of men. Then he sent over all England into each shire, and had it made out how many hundred hides there were

in the shire, and what the King himself had in lands, and of live-stock on the land, and what rights he ought to have every twelve months off the shire. Also, he had written how much land his archbishops had, and his suffragan bishops, and his abbots and earls, and, though I tell it at length, what or how much each man that owned land in England had in land and live-stock, and how much money it might be worth. So very narrowly he had it enquired into that there was not one single hide nor one yard of land, nor even—it is shame to be telling of, but he did not think it shame to be doing it—one ox nor one cow nor one swine was left out that was not set down in his record, and all the records were afterwards brought to him.”

The instructions for taking the survey ran thus:—

“The King’s barons [the Commissioners] enquire by oath of the sheriff of the shire and of all the barons [free tenants] and of the French-born of them and of the whole hundred, of the priest, the reeve, and six villans [copyholders] from each vill” . . . “the name of the manor, who held it T.R.E. [*tempore Regis Edvardi*, in the time of King Edward Confessor] and who held it now [1086], how many hides there were in each manor, how many plows on the domain, how many men, how many villans, how many cottars, how many bondsmen, how many freemen, how many socmen [freeholders in socage], how much wood, how much meadow, how much pasture; what mills, what fishponds; what had been added or taken away, what it was worth T.R.E., and how much it was worth now [1086]; how much each freeholder held; and whether more could be got out of it than now.”

Rights and claims were registered, as well as holdings and premiums. There were several sets of Commissioners, each with a separate circuit—*e.g.*, Bishop Remigius of Fécamp, Henry of Ferreires (Lord of Tutbury), Walter Giffard (afterwards Earl of Buckingham), and Adam Fitz Hubert, took the circuit in which Worcester lay; the south-western counties formed a circuit, and Oxford, Warwick, and Stafford shires were grouped together. Northumberland and Durham were not surveyed, probably because much of the north was wasted and empty. Cumberland, Westmorland, and North Lancashire were not yet parts of England. Rutland was surveyed under parts of North Hants and Lincolnshire, South Lancashire under parts of Yorkshire and Cheshire. We have in the Exon Domesday and in Vol. II. of the great Domesday Book examples of the draft returns for the five south-western and three eastern counties (Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex) respectively. A transcript of the original Cambridgeshire returns also exists. In the rest of the surveyed districts the draft returns were not

only arranged, but abridged, as in the first volume of the great Domesday.

The record being on oath was a regular verdict, and could not be disregarded, contradicted, or disallowed as evidence.

In compiling the draft returns each county was taken hundred by hundred, each hundred manor by hundred, and a numbered index of the tenants-in-chief (immediate crown-tenants) was affixed to each county; the king coming first, the rest following according to rank.

**How the Survey  
was taken.**

The Commissioners in putting down the returns of their local inquests, did not attempt to alter the local reckoning; hence in different parts of the country we find, as Mr. Round has lately shown—

The English reckoning :—1 hide = 4 virgates or yard—lands.

The Kentish reckoning :—1 suling = 4 yokes.

The Dano-Norman reckoning :—1 plowland or carrucate = 8 ox-gangs or bovates.

In each case this reckoning applied only to the arable, and to land which was *geldable*, liable for the King's land-tax, at so much per unit; the unit, whether called *suling*, *hide*, or *carrucate*, being always an ideal of 120 acres, whether the manor was worked on the two- or three-field system. After stating the *geldable area*, the *non-geldable area* is put down: this is sometimes land fresh tilled since the days of Ethelred when this land-tax or *geld* was first taken (probably on a local county assessment). For in the year 991 on a proposal (borrowed from Frankish and Roman expedients) of Archbishop Sigric, the first great payment of £10,000 was made by the nation as *gafol* to the Danes; but whether this first *Danegeld* was raised, as later payments in this reign probably were, by taxation on the hide, we do not know. Sometimes the *non-geldable land* is land that has received for some reason exception from this tax by the king's favour. After the return as to hidage and acres come the other returns called for by the king. The following specimen of a rural manor will show the way the returns were finally registered:—

“THE LAND OF WILLIAM OF BRAIOSE. In REDINGES hundred.

“William of Braiose holdeth of the king SUDCOTE. Brietward held it of K. Edward. [William the Norman has displaced Brietward the Englishman as royal tenant.]

"The land defended itself for two hides, now for one hide. [The old assessment for geld on this manor was for two hides, but for some satisfactory reason it is now assessed for one hide.]

"The land is of three plows. [The whole extent of arable is three plowlands though it was only assessed at two hides.]

"There is one in the domain [William manages one plowland himself] and five villans [copyhold tenants] and bordars [cottiers] with two plows [there are two teams in the domain].

"There is a mill of 18 shillings-worth and a fishery of 50 pence-worth.

"It [the estate] was worth £4; now [it is worth] 100 shillings."

A notable bit of the record is that touching Oxford, a new town come into note as the resting-place of a saint, a place of coinage under Alfred, a stronghold against the Danes under Edward, and a convenient meeting-place for great moots under Edgar and Ethelred. It embraces, as will be seen, not only taxation but amercements and rents and other dues.

"In the time of King Edward OXFORD used to pay for *toll* and *gafol* and all other customs yearly to the king £20 and 6 sestiers of honey. To Earl Ælfgar £10, besides a mill which he had inside the city. When the king went to war 20 burgesses used to go with him in place of all the others, or they used to give £20 to the king that all might be free. Now Oxford pays £60 by tale [not by weight, which would be unfavourable to the payer] of 20d. to the *ora* [a Danish money of account, twelve to the £]. In this said town, both within the wall and without, there are 243 houses paying geld, and beside these there are 500, less 22, so waste and destroyed that they cannot pay geld. . . . All the mansions which are called *mural*, T.R.E., were free from all custom save going to war and wall repair. . . . And if the wall, when there be need, be not restored by him who ought so to do, he shall either pay 40s. to the king or lose his mansion. All the burgesses of Oxford have in common outside the town a meadow paying 6s. 8d."

Among Oxfordshire customs are these:—"If any man break the king's peace given by hand or seal, so that he slay the man to whom the peace was given, both his life and lands shall be in the king's power if he be taken, and if he cannot be taken he shall be held an outlaw by all, and if anyone shall be able to slay him he shall have his spoils by law. If any stranger wishing to stay in Oxford and having a house without kin shall finish his life there, the king shall have what he leaves. If anyone by force break or enter any man's court or house to slay or wound or assault a man, he shall pay 100s. to the king as fine. Likewise he that is warned to go on service and goeth not shall give 100s. to the king. If anyone slay a man within his court or his house, himself and all his substance are at the king's will, save the dower of his wife if he have endowed her."

The general results of the survey may be summed up thus: There were about 5,000,000 acres under tillage, and about



300,000 families, *i.e.*, about 2,000,000 souls. This population was thus divided as to tenure :—

(a)	{ 1,400 tenants-in-chief 7,900 under-tenants }	gentry and clergy.	
(b)	{ 12,000 liberi hommes 23,000 socmen }	freeholders yeomen	N. of Watling St. S. of Yorks.
(c)	{ 109,000 villans 90,000 cottars and bordars }	copyholders small copyholders	{ W. of Lincoln and Essex. E. of Cheshire. S. of Thames mostly.
(d)	25,000 boudsmen	landless labourers	{ S. of Midlands and S.W.

The burgesses and many of the clergy are not reckoned, so that any estimate of their number must be drawn from other sources.

Of the tenants-in-chief the greater part were "Frenchmen"—soldiers who had come over to fight with William, or churchmen who had come over to pray for him; and the greater part of the under-tenants of good estate were "Frenchmen" too. Thus in Oxfordshire only a few thanes (such as Lefwine, Osmund, Sawold, Siward the huntsman) and the ecclesiastical foundations and priests remained as before the Conquest. The king, besides the royal manors, had got the forfeited lands of Earls Harold and Edwin; Queen Eadgyth's land had been parted among Norman barons; the Norman bishops of Bayeux and Lisieux, the transmarine Abbey des Préaux, and William's new foundation of Battle got possessions in the country at the expense of English owners. Earls Hugh of Chester, Alberic of Northumberland, Robert of Mortain, William of Hereford, Eustace of Boulogne, William of Evreux, and barons of the houses of Ivri, Toden, Gifard, Pevrel, Hesding, Ansculf, became the king's tenants, while English landowners such as Archbishop Stigand, Earl Tosti, Turgot, Alfric, Hacon, Godric, and their heirs were ousted. Robert d'Oily married Ealdgyth, the daughter of a great English landowner, Wigod of Wallingford, and got about half of his father-in-law's estates in the shire. In fact, one may sum up the change in England by saying that some 20,000 foreigners replaced some 20,000 Englishmen; and that these newcomers got the throne, the earldoms, the

Change of  
Ownership.

bishoprics, the abbacies, and far the greater portion of the big estates, mediate and immediate, and many of the burgess holdings in the chief towns. The English owners had either fallen in battle or fled into exile, or, if they remained, they had forfeited their estates by armed or avowed resistance to the new and crowned king. In some cases the new landowner married the former landowner's daughter, as in the instance given above, or his widow, but this was not by any means the usual case; and the accounts we have of English nobles and barons flying to Scotland and to East Europe show that the newcomers mostly ousted the former owners and their heirs. William had to pay his fellow-conquerors and to keep up an army. This could only be done in a regular way by endowing them; and, both to reward men who had risked much in his quarrel and to enable him to hold what he had, he had to parcel out the forfeited lands, bit by bit, as he won them. We need not suppose any settled policy of dividing his great barons' estates (a policy of which we have not any good ancient authority). The fact of the Conquest occurring piecemeal will account for the fact of many great Norman landowners holding lands in many counties. Thus Hugh of Chester seems to have held lands in Stafford, which were afterwards exchanged for possessions elsewhere; but he retained land in twenty-one several counties, Robert of Mortain in twenty, Odo of Bayeux in seventeen, Eustace of Boulogne in twelve. There were forty-one great vassals with estates in more than six counties—laymen all. Nor was William afraid of handsomely rewarding his fellow-venturers, especially those of his own blood. Thus, Robert of Mortain, his brother, got 793 manors: Odo of Bayeux, another brother, 439; Alan of Brittany, a kinsman, 442. Some of William's shrievalties became hereditary, some of his earldoms were palatine, but he took care not to make many new earls; and the condition of regular military service—so many armed knights to be supplied for so much land (as Mr. Round has shown)—whereby the irregular and varied thane-services were replaced by more regular requirements, told probably in favour of the Crown.

The new landowners, though they might have made a little different bargain with the king than their forerunners, yet had not a whit more power or less over their tenants by

law or custom; and the old folk-moots, courts of hundred, and hall-motes, subsisted as before with the old fines, fees, and forfeitures. Every free unlanded man still had to find a responsible patron, and every free landed man to be in a local peace-pledge society; every freeman had to take oath of allegiance to the king as before. The king's rents were still largely paid in kind, and the first scale of commutation (remembered a century later) was an ox 1s., sheep 4d., fodder for twenty horses 4d., bread for 100 men 1s. The statutes of William the Conqueror are mostly re-enactments of former kings' laws, and his chief innovations are his substitution, out of piety, of mutilation for capital punishment; his arrangements to prevent the murder of the Frenchmen that came with him by strengthening the police arrangements as to fines, etc.; and his ordinance separating the temporal and spiritual pleas, confining the latter to the bishops' jurisdiction.

It is well here to remember (as Bishop Stubbs points out) that the new aristocracy was largely **The Newcomers.** akin to the Norman duke. Thus of the ducal house came the Earls of Brionne, Evreux, Eu, Mortain, Kent; while from marriage-kinship there was a close connection with the Beaumonts of Mellent, and the houses of Montgomery, Warenne, Giffard and Breteuil. The other three great Norman families came from Yves of Belesme, Bernard the Dane, and Osmond of Coutville, also allies of the ducal house, as the Court legends sufficiently attest. The old list of ships, though by no means authoritative or complete, shows the kind of help given by Norman barons to the king.

	Ships. Knights.			Ships. Knights.	
William FitzOsbern ...	60	—	Remi, Bishop of Lincoln	1	20
Hugh, Earl of Chester	60	—	Nicholas, Abbot of St.		
Robert, Earl of Eu ...	60	—	Owen .. ...	20	100
Robert, Earl of Mortain	120	—	Hugh of Montfort Con-		
Roger of Beaumont ...	60	—	stable... ..	50	—
Roger of Montgomery	60	—	Gerald the Steward ...	40	—
Walter Giffard ... ..	30	100	Fulc the Lane .. ...	40	—
Odo, Bishop of Bayeux	100	—	William, Earl of Evreux	80	—

Other Normans that brought good help were Ralf of Conches, William of Warenne, Hugh of Grantmesnil, Roger of Mowbray, Baldwin and Richard of Brionne, Hugh the Butler, and Aimery of Thouars. William's allies, "his good

1216]

neighbours\* Bretons, Mancels [men of Maine], Angevins, men of Ponthieu and Boulogne"† and French, "to whom he promised land if he could conquer England, rich pay and good bounties" (though neither the King of France nor the Earl of Flanders would aid his enterprise), saw to it that his promises were carried out. Only one knight and one churchman out of the great host that sailed in "three thousand ships and three" to maintain William's claim to the crown are recorded to have refused to take other men's goods and estates. Even the cooks, the huntsmen, and other body-servants of the king, got their share of the land, though he took care to settle no mercenaries after the first conquest, and preferred to raise a heavy tax rather than make unjust confiscations. William I., like Edward I., was a law-abiding king, and in face of even great temptations he seldom broke his own rules, and never violated the oath he had sworn and the promise he had made to rule as his predecessor had ruled, according to the laws and customs of the land, putting down evil and maintaining mercy and righteousness.

The Conquest meant, indeed, that the executive, the central administration and the local government, temporal and spiritual, had been taken over by a new set of men—better managers, keener, more unscrupulous, less drunken and quarrelsome, better trained, hardier, thriftier, more in sympathy with the general European movements, more adventurous, more temperate. The result was inevitably better organisation, quicker progress, great exactions and oppressions in Church and State; for the under-tenants were not in sympathy with their new lords, and both sides stood on the letter of the law (which necessarily favoured the lord); a new and vigorous foreign policy, the extension of the English king's domains and claims within and without these islands. But (contrary to a venerable belief) the English tongue and the English law held their own throughout the realm, and within a century the French baron had become an English lord.

**The Effects  
of the Conquest.**

Outwardly, the greatest changes were the building of many

\* Alan of Brittany, William's son-in-law, and Ralf Guader, Earl of Norfolk, were the chief among the Bretons, a very powerful contingent.

† Eustace III., Earl of Boulogne, a kinsman of Edward the Confessor, led these.

great keeps and bailies by the king and his richest barons, and the continuance of the movement that had already begun of raising churches and large minsters in stone. Agriculture must have been rather checked than helped by the heavy taxes and devastations of civil war. But though the towns suffered grievously by war, and by the clearance necessary for the sites of the castles, commerce grew and flourished. Besides the questionable benefit of the arrival of the Jews who followed the Conquest, with a view to the disposal of the vast plunder, just as they had followed the Northmen in Gaul two centuries earlier, many Norman merchants settled in London and other market towns and seaports.

THE accession of William Rufus against the support given to

**A. L. SMITH.**  
**The Reign of**  
**William Rufus.**  
**1067-1100.**

Robert by the Norman barons was a victory for the English people. It was to the people that he promised good government and their own old customs, to win their aid and that of the Church, already beginning to act as the people's champion. It was the levy of the people that enabled him to drive off Duke Robert's fleet at Pevensey, and to take Rochester castle and with it his uncle, Bishop Odo, the head of the Norman revolt. It was the same levy that he summoned in 1094 to Hastings to the number of 20,000 to repel a threatened invasion from France. His very tyranny and greed fell less on the mass of the people than on the great feudatories. It is true he was merciless in his fines and savagely jealous of his forest rights, and he used the local courts as mere engines of extortion while his shameless life and blasphemous sayings deeply shocked the best feelings of his age. But at least he allowed no tyranny in England but his own. He crushed another feudal rising in 1095, and confiscated the lands of Mowbray of Northumberland and others for taking part in it. He repulsed an invasion of Malcolm, King of Scots, in 1091, forced him to renew his homage, wrested from him the district of Carlisle, and colonised it with English settlers. By his grants—as, for instance, to Montgomery and Lacy—the English border advanced rapidly westwards at the expense of the Welsh, despite the check caused by a raid upon Anglesey by Magnus of Norway, who defeated Hugh, Earl of Chester,

1216]

there. His reign, almost in spite of himself, fostered that alliance between Crown and people which, begun almost at the Norman Conquest in their common interest against feudal anarchy, has ever since been so characteristic of English history. In the wars, too, against Scots and Welsh, and even against the French, the English took up their Norman rulers' quarrel as their own. Only when he set himself against the new Archbishop Anselm did he take up a position in which the nation would be against him. The king himself, on a bed of sickness and in a temporary fit of penitence, having sworn to amend his ways, had hastened to fill up the vacant See of Canterbury, and had forced the appointment upon Anselm, an Italian by birth, now Abbot of Bec, in Normandy, and the most famous churchman of his time. But as soon as the king recovered, he resented Anselm's conduct in the matter of the customary present on consecration, and resisted his resolution to receive his pall, the archiepiscopal vestment, from none but Pope Urban II. Worst of all in both points the king next attacked Anselm for alleged neglect in the equipment of his feudal contingent. When at last the archbishop, weary of strife, left England to lay his case before the Pope, the king fell upon the lands of the See, and cruelly treated the tenants. But the crowds which surrounded the departing prelate with almost idolatrous affection, and welcomed him as a saint on his return, were an omen of the course of those future struggles in which the kings were to find that the nation, loyal as it was to the Crown, owned a higher loyalty still to the Church.

Alliance between Crown and people had been the mark of William II.'s reign; but in a much more intimate sense it becomes the guiding principle of Henry I.'s policy. His accession he owed to his being an Atheling, the English-born son of a king; to his own promptitude and use of his treasures; to his immediate recall of Anselm; but above all to the Charter which he published. This promised not merely a relaxation of the feudal rules which his brother had strained to the uttermost against his tenants-in-chief, but also ordered that the barons should in their turn give the same relaxation in dealing with their vassals. The Charter promised also that "the laws of Edward"—that is, the Old English offices and institutions—should be preserved. When he married Edith, daughter of

Henry I.

1100-1135.

Malcolm and niece of Edgar Atheling, the people felt they had again an English king; he was identified with "the Lion of Justice" of Merlin's prophecies. When the leading barons joined Robert of Normandy in his claim of the English throne, the English people so heartily aided their king that he was able to attack and reduce in succession the four castles of Robert of Belesme, who, as representative of the great house of Montgomery and lord of two earldoms in England and two in Normandy, was the acknowledged head of the feudal party. This man was of the worst type of feudal lord, and with his overthrow, said the exulting English, the king had now become a king indeed. From 1104 Henry's chief activity was in France. Indeed, the long struggle of the royal power against the baronage was fought out in these fields from 1104 to 1118. The battle of Tenchebrai, 1106, made him master of Normandy, and consigned Duke Robert to a life-long captivity. With Anjou and Brittany he formed alliances, and married his daughter Matilda to the Emperor Henry V. But he was harassed by intrigues in favour of Duke Robert's son, William Clito, till the latter's death in 1126. Meanwhile the strength of Henry's position in England had been shown by the reception of his own son William in 1115 as future king; and he was even able, after his son's tragical death at the wreck of the White Ship, 1120, to have the same oaths taken to his daughter Matilda in 1126. The process of the subjugation of Wales, despite frequent Welsh revolts, was continued by the energy of Earl Strongbow, the building of castles in the country, and the planting of colonies of Flemings in Pembrokeshire.

The internal history of the reign is a history of steady advance in good government. The local  
**Internal Reform.** courts of hundred and shire were revived; the local customs of the towns were recognised and recorded in charters; the central Exchequer system was being steadily developed; itinerant justices were sent out on circuits; the coinage was amended, the abuses of purveyance restrained, the old payments in kind replaced by money taxes. A new nobility was raised up from Englishmen and from Normans of lesser rank. These men served the king as ministers in Exchequer and in Curia, and were rewarded with the confiscated lands of the older baronage of the north. The line



of great Justiciars, the king's lieutenants in military and judicial powers, begins in 1107 with Roger the Poor, Bishop of Salisbury, and his family. The feudal Council begins to show a division into greater and lesser barons, the line of division destined to grow into the deeper demarcation between House of Lords and House of Commons. The native chronicles are full, indeed, of lamentations over plague and famine and murrain, and "the heavy taxes which never slackened." But the same chroniclers are emphatic in their acknowledgment of the prompt and stern justice which began to make England, after the incorrigible anarchy and violence of Anglo-Saxon times, a land of unwonted order and peace. "A good man he was, and all men stood in awe of him. No man durst misdo against another in his time. He made peace for man and beast." Men came to speak of the laws of King Henry's days as they had hitherto spoken of the laws of King Edward, and with much better reason; for Henry I. laid the foundations on which his greater grandson built up the enduring fabric of the English Constitution—a Norman superstructure upon an English basis. Even the greatest of all the mediæval problems, the relation of Church and State, was brought at least to a temporary solution by the mingled firmness and moderation of the king. A compromise was made (1107) which would be sure to work well for the Crown. The bishop-elect was to do homage to the king, and only then receive his spiritual insignia—the ring and pastoral staff—from spiritual hands. This settlement emphasised better the spiritual character of the episcopate; but the bishops were also great barons, and over them, as over other barons, the Crown kept its hold by the ceremony of homage. The best tribute to the work and character of Henry I. is the outburst of feudalism in its most hateful form which followed as soon as the strong hand of the last real Norman ruler was removed.

THE Conquest had a great and immediate effect on the English Church. The invasion itself had been from the first made to bear something of the character of a religious work. It was at once a mission, the claiming of a lawful heritage filched

W. H. HUTTON.  
Religion.

by a perjured usurper, and a Crusade before the Crusaders.

**The Conquest and  
the Church.**

The invaders, coming to a conquest that was blessed by the Pope, were pledged of necessity to change in Church as in State. We have seen that the condition of the Church warranted, if it did not necessitate, a change. It was one of the great aims of the Conqueror to carry it through.

The first four years of the reign were fully occupied with material and physical contest. The ecclesiastical reformation had perforce to wait till the land was fully conquered by the sword. When that was done, in 1070 William turned to work which he had had in mind from the first. In the Easter feast at Winchester, with Papal legates by his side, he began to provide for the governance of the English Church.

Ealdred of York, who had anointed him king, was dead. Stigand of Canterbury, who had received his pallium from the anti-Pope, Benedict X., was with ease deposed as uncanonical. With him fell his brother Æthelmaer, Bishop of the East Angles, a married man. Bishops and abbots fled or were deprived. Their places were filled generally, but not always, by men of foreign race. The great prize of all, the Primacy

**Lanfranc.**

of all England, was conferred on one than whom there was no man in Europe worthier to fill it. Lanfranc, the law-student of Pavia, then Prior of Bec, now abbot of William's own great Church of St. Stephen at Caen, the scholar, statesman, administrator, friend of the stern Conqueror, was consecrated in the metropolitan church to be what the Worcester annalist of the time calls "the English Pope." There is in this phrase—a phrase repeated when Pope Urban greeted Anselm as "alterius orbis Papa"—a real meaning. Just as the Old

**The Church and  
the Papacy.**

English kings, when the Welsh and Scots had submitted to their sway, began to take to themselves Imperial titles and the badges of Imperial authority—thus claiming to be apart from the great Roman Empire, and to rule a little empire of their own—so the English Primates, who had exercised spiritual supremacy over many kingdoms before England yet was one, had felt themselves, and were recognised to be, patriarchs of the nations beyond the sea. That William was determined such

should be the position of those who ruled the English Church we see clearly enough from the letters that passed between him and that greatest of mediæval Popes, the Hildebrand of Clugny and Canossa, Pope Gregory VII. Nothing so clearly brings back the life of those times as the letters—now cautious, now familiar—which passed between the clear-sighted statesmen who ruled over peoples so different and lands so far separate, each with a clear keen purpose and a stern unbending will. To Gregory William is the “dearest king,” the “unique and precious son of the holy Roman Church,” whom he has ever in his prayers; but whom he must at times admonish, lest he fall into great condemnation. To William Gregory was his Father and Pontiff, whose prayers he craved, and whose “Romescot” he would pay. But when it came to a question between them that the English king should profess himself the Pope’s man—and this the Pope asked—then the answer was clear and brief. No fealty had William ever promised; none had his predecessors paid. As they did, so would he: he was the rightful successor of the good King Edward.

Such relation between king and Pope could not be maintained if the first man in England after the sovereign, the chief bishop of the English Church, were himself in league with the Roman Pontiff. It seems certain that no question ever arose between William and Lanfranc; their agreement had been confirmed, we may be sure, years before it was carried out on English soil. But though no division arose between king and archbishop, it was clear to all men what were the rules of the king’s dealings with Rome. These rules seemed to the historian a novelty; but the circumstances and the men were also new. “He would not suffer,” says Eadmer, “that anyone in all his dominions should receive the Pontiff of the City of Rome as apostolic Pope”—there were then many contests on vacancies in the Holy See—“except at his command, or should on any condition receive his letters if they had not been first shown to himself. He did not suffer the Primate of his kingdom, the Archbishop of Canterbury, if he had called together under his primacy an assembly of bishops, to enact or prohibit anything but what was agreeable to his will and had been first ordained by him. He did not allow any of his bishops publicly to implead, excommunicate, or constrain by penalty of ecclesiastical rigour any of his barons or servants

who was informed against for adultery or any capital crime, except by his own command." And, further, he exercised—so Henry I. claimed—a control upon the reception of Papal legates by the English Church.

These customs, though it does not appear that it ever came to a question of enforcing them, formed a precedent for later sovereigns, and often a battle-ground between the rulers in Church and State. But they created at least as many difficulties as they solved. It might be necessary to limit the power of Church assemblies, and to restrain the exercise of spiritual power by which the king in consorting with his own men might become, as it were by a by-blow, excommunicate. When so much of the foreign policy of the country was conducted through the Papal Curia, where the strings of all international relations were held, it was undoubtedly wise to control such recognition of a Supreme Pontiff, when two opponents claimed the Chair of St. Peter, as might commit the English king, against his will, to a warfare with the emperor and the emperor's nominee. But no concordat on the lines of the historic maxim "*Cujus regio ejus religio*" has ever been wholly satisfactory or successful. It may work well where Church and State, as under Lanfranc and William, are agreed; but a bad king or an archbishop with a policy of his own must soon upset the arrangement.

It might seem that by these rules William intended to tie the hands of the Church; but if he fettered her action in one direction, he enlarged her freedom in another. The Church courts, under the Old English kings, though they retained jurisdiction over moral questions and the doctrine and discipline of the clergy, had become assimilated in procedure, in time of session, and even in the persons attending them, to the local courts of hundred and shire. The bishop sat in the shire-moot, and there, without adjourning to his own court, he would hear suits which to the strict lawyers and canonists of Normandy seemed wholly apart from lay jurisdiction. William and Lanfranc, though they were no obedient vassals of the Pope, were thoroughly imbued with the spirit of order and the love of distinction and definition which animated the legal mind of Gregory VII. It was intolerable to them, as it would have been to him, that any branch of law should be carried on as it were at

haphazard. Thus an edict was issued by the king with the object of putting an end to confusion, and making Church and lay courts separate in action as they were in idea. No longer were bishops and archdeacons to hear ecclesiastical cases in the hundred-courts. They were to try their causes in their own courts, and "*secundum episcopales leges et sanctorum canonum praecepta*," not by customary law. They were to allow no spiritual questions to come before lay judges. Laymen, too, were forbidden to intrude themselves into ecclesiastical causes. The king would, through the sheriff, enforce the sentence of excommunication when issued by the bishop. While William thus placed the Church courts in a position of considerable freedom and independence, he gave to the clergy also an important part in the ordinary criminal jurisdiction. The "*ultima ratio*" in criminal cases was the ordeal, the solemn appeal to the judgment of God. This was now definitely placed under the control of the bishops, and was to be held only in their cathedral cities or in other places chosen by them.

The importance of these changes of the Conqueror can hardly be overrated. The clergy, placed under a government which became more centralised every year, found themselves in possession of new powers and expected to show a class interest separate and independent of the rest of their countrymen. This interest was contended for hotly during the next two centuries, and the contest was a means of securing national freedom through the assertion of class privilege. But the growth of canon law, combined with the action of the Church courts and the revived study of the civil law, had a very natural result in the recognition of the Papal Court as a tribunal of appeal.

These measures of William and of Lanfranc cannot be taken by themselves; they were part of a Church Reform. general scheme for the purification and elevation of the Church. Not only were the bishoprics now filled by foreigners, but the Sees themselves were removed from the country villages or small towns to cities. Thus Sherborne was deserted for the hill fortress of Old Sarum, Dorchester for Lincoln, Thetford for Norwich, Wells for Bath, Selsey for Chichester, Lichfield for Chester; and the bishops found themselves in the society of the warrior and the

burgher rather than the monk and the hind. Great efforts, too, were made to check the marriage of the clergy and the growth of an hereditary ecclesiastical caste. Social evils were combated with zeal. Lanfranc and the good English bishop Wulfstan, whom no envy or avarice was strong enough to dislodge from the See of Worcester, which he served with such sagacity and holiness, made crusade against the kidnapping and slave-trade in the port of Bristol. All through we can see that the king's aim was to bring peace to the land and to the Church. He was not always successful. At St. Albans the tombs of the English abbots were destroyed by their Norman successor. At Glastonbury, Thurstan, in his unwisdom, called in his archers against the monks who loved their old Gregorian chants more than the new singing of William of Fécamp. "Then were the monks sore afeard of them, and wist not what to do, and fled hither and thither. . . . And a rueful thing there happened that day, for the Frenchmen brake into the choir, and shot towards the altar where the monks were, and some of the knights went up to the up-floor (the triforium) and shot downwards towards the halidom (sanctuary), so that on the rood that stood above the altar stuck on many arrows. And the wretched monks lay about the altar, and some crept under it, and cried with yearning to God, craving His mildness for that they could get no mildness from men. What may we say but that they shot sorely, and that others brake down the doors there and went in and slew some of the monks to death, and many wounded therein, so that the blood came from the altar upon the graden [steps], and from the graden upon the floor" (A. S. Chron. A.D. 1083). But such strife was rare, and this was sternly punished. In most parts French and English were soon knit together by the bonds of the Church. Seven monasteries under St. Wulfstan joined themselves together—humble monks of English birth and rulers of the conquering race—as one heart and one soul. A pleasant illustration of the good-fellowship into which the two peoples soon entered comes to us from St. Albans. There even the insolent abbot Paul, who swept away the tombs of his predecessors, received from the English Ligulf and his wife two bells for the minster. "How sweetly bleat my goats and my sheep," said the worthy Englishman when he heard the new bells ring.

Such in the main was the result of the Conqueror's reign: the bells of peace sounded above the chance local frays. So long as Lanfranc lived the peace continued; even the wild Rufus held his hand for fear of the wise man whom his father had loved. But when he died there began the carrying out of what seems to have been a deliberate policy of despiritualising the Church. The Sees were kept vacant and their revenues appropriated.

William II. and  
the Church.

The appointments that were made were a matter of sale and barter; and men were placed in the most sacred offices whose merit was only their assistance to the king in his tyranny and vice. Ranulf Flambard, who "drave the gemots throughout all England," was given the bishopric of Durham, a palatine See like those of the great German prince bishops, which made its possessor a petty sovereign. At length, in 1093, a seemingly mortal illness brought the Red King to a fit of superstitious remorse, in which he filled up the See of Canterbury by the appointment of Anselm. No better choice could have been made. Spiritual where Lanfranc

St. Anselm.

was only statesmanlike, Anselm combined in rare perfection the virtues of the philosopher and the saint. A Burgundian of Aosta, he had ruled the famous abbey of Bec with a gentle reasonableness more effective than severity. He was tender-hearted but resolute, high-minded yet child-like, and about the absolute purity of his devotion no slightest breath of doubt could cling. In the simple cell at Bec he thought out the remarkable books, the "*Monologion*" and the "*Proslogion*," which show the Christian Platonism of the Middle Ages in one of its most fascinating aspects, and in the "*Cur Deus Homo*" he elaborated an argument which has profoundly influenced theology down to our own time.

Anselm accepted the archbishopric only on compulsion, but when at last he did so he had no intention of placing his conduct under the direction of any temporal prince. He was not to be terrified by the ferocity of the king, or entrapped into concession by the guile of treacherous bishops. From the moment of the king's recovery difficulties arose. There was the question of English acknowledgment of a Pope; and Anselm finally induced William to recognise Urban II. There was the question about the pallium, the badge of the primacy, made from the white wool of the lambs of St. Agnes



and sent by the Pope to the archbishop; and Anselm stoutly resisted the claim of the king to place it on his shoulders; and at last, by one of those prudent compromises to which his wise humility inclined him, took it himself from the altar at Canterbury, on which it was laid. There was the accusation of supplying for the Welsh war a contingent insufficient for his feudal obligations. There were the ceaseless exactions of the king and distresses of the Church; and these at last led to Anselm's departure, in 1097, to seek the counsel of the Pope.

Three years later the new king, Henry I., called the archbishop back again with expressions of reverence:—"Myself and the people of the whole land I commit to your counsel and

**The Church Under  
Henry I.**

that of those who ought with you to counsel me." Anselm returned as the first constitutional adviser of the Crown, and became in 1101 the means of uniting clergy and people in support of the king against the invasion of his brother Robert and the faithless barons. For a time it seemed as though the days of the Conqueror were returned. Church and State

**The Contest  
Concerning  
Investitures.**

were in firm alliance. But it was impossible for England to keep out of the European contest. Henry claimed, as did the monarchs of the Continent, that it was his to appoint bishops and abbots, and to invest them with the ring and pastoral staff, the symbols of the prelacy. Before the significance of this had been seen the claim had been tacitly assented to; Anselm himself had received investiture at the hands of Rufus. But the Church, in a Lateran Council at which Anselm had himself been present, had now decided that it must be a question of principle to preserve the spiritual character of the appointments, and to protest against "the shame and mischief of allowing great Church offices to be disposed of by the kings and princes of the time without an effort to assert their meaning and sacredness." This was a point at which there could be no concession. Appeals for the guidance of the Pope only confirmed Anselm in his steadfastness. Henry persisted in his demands, Anselm in his refusals; and at length the archbishop set out for Rome "in the king's peace, invested with all that belonged to him," to win a settlement at the Papal Court. This settlement, due largely to his own tact and tolerance, and an anticipation by

1216]

sixteen years of the Concordat of Worms, which ended the investiture dispute abroad, gave to the king the right of bestowing the temporalities alone, and of receiving the homage and fealty of the bishop-elect before consecration, while "the king granted and decreed that from that time forth for ever no one should be invested in England with bishopric or abbey, by staff or ring, either by the king or by any lay hand." So the chief point of dispute was ended, and, as it seemed, in favour of the Church. But Henry still treated the ecclesiastical offices as a means of rewarding his ministers, and during his reign the character of the episcopate underwent a complete change. William the Conqueror, though he had appointed foreigners to the Sees which he had made vacant for them, had preferred men who would serve the Church. Henry sought and rewarded those who were already ministers of the State. That the chapters had a right to elect their superiors he allowed; but the election must be held in his court, and his candidates, without compulsion, must be chosen. With such canonical election was Roger a poor priest who had first attracted the king's attention by the rapidity with which he could say mass "fitly for hunting men," and had proved himself as steward and as chancellor to be *magnus in secularibus*, chosen Bishop of Salisbury. He became justiciar, and the offices of State were in time filled by his kinsfolk as they were organised by his hand. Under him grew up the great system of financial centralisation depending on the Exchequer, of which his great-nephew has left a curious account.

THE nineteen years which are known as the reign of Stephen are more truly to be regarded as an interval of mere anarchy between the reigns of two great rulers and organisers. But this brief

A. L. SMITH.  
The Reign of  
Stephen, 1135-1154.

period, given over, as it seems to be, to blank confusion, to utter turmoil and misery, is yet a period which in several ways has a unique place and interest in the story of the English race. These nineteen years determined how and where the two component elements of that race should be blended into one. They taught to the stubborn English spirit of local independence that essential lesson, the need of

submission to centralisation, which even the dreadful years of Danish invasions and the dark hour of Norman conquest had failed effectually to teach. By allowing for once a real reign of feudalism, they made it for ever after impossible in England. Finally, in these years of chaos, the two centres of hope and progress in the mediæval world—that is, the Church and the town—made a decided advance in power and in claims.

On the death of Henry I. the feudal party refused to abide by the oaths which the late king had made them swear to his daughter Matilda. Their Norman pride could not endure to be ruled by the wife of a Count of Anjou. Stephen, son of William the Conqueror's daughter, already endowed with English estates and allied by marriage to one of the baronial families, and himself a man of gallant and generous spirit, was regarded by them as one of themselves. London supported him, to avoid what seemed a foreign rule; the aid of his brother, the Bishop of Winchester, and his own absolute submission to clerical demands, won the Church to his side.

But the inherent weakness of his position forced him to call in mercenaries from abroad, and to lavish on his partisans titles and pensions and, above all, the fatal permission to raise new castles. In three years the new king had quarrelled with Robert, Earl of Gloucester, Matilda's half-brother; had been attacked by David, King of Scotland, her uncle; and had even thrown his own brother the bishop into the ranks of his foes by quarrelling with the powerful family group of ecclesiastics who had held the chief State offices since 1101. The landing of Matilda in 1139 was the signal for the open outbreak of civil war. In the course of this war Stephen was captured at Lincoln and imprisoned, but exchanged for Earl Robert; Henry of Winchester, now Papal Legate, changed sides once more; London revolted again; and Matilda, who owed to her rival's unpopularity a brief success, owed its loss to her own imperious folly.

With her withdrawal to Normandy in 1146, and the death of her half-brother Robert, her cause languished till 1148. In that year her son Henry, now aged fifteen, arrived in Scotland, and began to attack England from that side. In 1150 he was made Duke of Normandy, and soon succeeded to Maine and Anjou. But after his marriage in 1152 to

Eleanor of Aquitaine had made him lord of two-thirds of modern France, his mere advent in England was enough to force his rival to the compromise called the Treaty of Wallingford. Stephen was to retain the crown for life; and Henry was to be adopted as his son and to succeed him.

During this long conflict the nobles had made hardly a pretence of even party loyalty; it was a greedy scramble for power, and that of the

**The Anarchy.**

worst feudal kind. "In olden days" (says the chronicler, William of Newburgh) "there was no king in Israel, and everyone did that which was right in his own eyes; but in England now it was worse; for there was a king, but impotent, and every man did what was wrong in his own eyes." The Peterborough continuation of the English Chronicle sums up all in words with which in their pregnant simplicity no modern description can possibly vie:—"They filled the land full of castles, and filled the castles with devils. They took all those that they deemed had any goods, men and women, and tortured them with tortures unspeakable; many thousand they slew with hunger . . . they robbed and burned all the villages, so that thou mightest fare a day's journey nor ever find a man dwelling in a village nor land tilled. Corn, flesh, and cheese, there was none in the land. The bishops were ever cursing them, but they cared nought therefor, for they were all forcurse and forsworn and forlorn. . . . Men said openly that Christ slept and His saints. Such and more than we can say we suffered nineteen winters for our sins."

Without such grim experience of what feudalism unmastered would be, the education of the English race would have been incomplete. Unlicensed castles, private wars, private coinage, seigniorial jurisdiction, these outward signs of the feudal spirit are written at large on this page alone of our history. But meanwhile the silent unwritten processes of growth were working all for good. The boroughs—as a comparison shows of their charters under Henry I. with those won under Henry II.—were advancing steadily, and no doubt served as havens from the disorders outside. The Church itself was as a strong city of refuge. As Becket reminded Henry II., it was the Church who transferred the crown from Stephen to him. It was the Church who at the crisis of Henry I.'s death

claimed the right "to elect and to ordain the king," who rejected the succession of Stephen's son Eustace, "the child of a perjured man"; who declared that the God of Battles had decided the ordeal against Stephen; and who, when at length peace was made, blessed it with the blessing of Isaiah's prophecies.

In that other important but almost hidden process, the fusion of Norman with English blood, the Church again plays its part; for the best evidence of this fusion lies in two events which are both under clerical direction. These are the Crusading expedition of 1138, which took Lisbon from the Moors; and the "Battle of the Standard," a defeat of the Scots at Northallerton, 1138, by the militia of the northern shires, accompanied by their parish priests, bearing as standard a crucifix. On each of these occasions English yeomen obey Norman leaders; English and Normans are called "the sons of one mother"; English and Norman traditions are alike invoked. We are prepared for the official testimony a few years later that owing to intermarriages it had become impossible to distinguish English from Norman, except in the case of serfs.

The wheel had come round; the evil of the day of Senlac was worked out; its good effects—the vivifying and widening of Anglo-Saxon life and character by the keener, loftier Norman temper, the defining and concentrating of Anglo-Saxon institutions by the Norman genius for organisation, the stimulating and awakening of Anglo-Saxon patriotism by the Norman tyranny—were by this time incorporated and absorbed. From this period of fierce trial there emerges as from a furnace a new product—the English national character; and to its fusion of Norman fire with Saxon earnestness we owe the noblest scenes in our "rough island story" and the most imaginative creations of our unrivalled literature.

The Plantagenet family, who began with Henry II.—an occupation of the throne that was to last for more than three hundred years—were a family of characters so remarkable that contemporaries accounted for them by tracing their descent back to a demon ancestress. Of them all, perhaps Henry II. was the most remarkable. Strong man as he was, all his capacities of

**The Reign of  
Henry II., 1154—1159.**

mind and body, all his organising genius and clearness of purpose, his fiery energy and harsh, stubborn will, were needed for the task before him. That was, to build up a lasting fabric of centralised power. This meant that he must finally crush feudalism, call in the conquered race to co-operate in political work, and weld together English local institutions with Norman principles of centralisation.

His first measures were drastic enough, but were facilitated by the exhaustion of the land after the civil wars and the withdrawal of many barons to the Holy Land for the Crusade of 1147. "Those ravening wolves, the Flemish hirelings, were driven forth; the new castles razed; the Crown demesnes and revenues recovered; and justice set to work again." Here and there a Mortimer or a Bigod showed fight for a brief while, but as a whole the feudal party looked on and made no sign while for nineteen years the unresting king was founding deep and strong his administrative and judicial system, on which, when at last the barons awoke, their forces dashed themselves in vain.

This result, demonstrated thus in 1173, was already a foregone conclusion when in 1159 the barons accepted the king's offer to commute for a money payment the military service due for their fiefs. By this institution of scutage the king at one stroke destroyed the military strength of feudalism and supplied himself with a far more convenient mercenary force for his war abroad.

For Henry II., though wise enough to feel that England was the real key of his dominions, yet, being lord in his own and his wife's right of two-thirds of France, was more often abroad than not, and was rarely free from war with his neighbour the King of France. In 1158 he had betrothed his son Geoffrey to the heiress of Brittany, and himself became guardian of the Duchy on the Duke's death in 1165. In 1159 he laid claim to the county of Toulouse, and was embroiled in constant, if rather uneventful, warfare with King Louis VII. This became an important fact when Louis offered shelter to Thomas Henry and Becket.

Becket in 1167. Becket had been Henry's confidant and boon companion from the very outset of the reign, and from the Chancellorship was advanced in 1162 to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. By a transition not infrequent even in more

recent times the new prelate at once assumed the loftiest ecclesiastical attitude. Henry as part of his judicial reforms had attempted to curb the "privilege of clergy," which had been so interpreted as to screen the most outrageous criminals. One clerk had ruined the honour of a family, and tried to murder its head; another put poison in the sacramental cup. Both were beyond the punishment of the civil courts. This quarrel led to the exile of Becket for six years. On his return, when he proceeded to vengeance against the royalist prelates, the king broke out into such a fury of rage that four of the king's knights set forth to coerce Becket to more submissive conduct. The struggle that ensued led to Becket's murder in Canterbury Cathedral. This was the fatal blunder of Henry II.'s life, and the dividing-point of the prosperous from the disastrous period of his reign. Its first effect was to raise such an outburst of religious feeling that he had to escape from it by an expedition to Ireland.

**Henry and Ireland.** A Bull of Adrian IV. in 1156 had already assumed to annex Ireland to the English crown, and in 1170 Richard de Clare (Strongbow) had taken Dublin, married the heiress of Dermot, King of Leinster, and succeeded to that province. Henry now marched through Ireland, receiving homage from all the native chiefs, and left Strongbow as his deputy to govern the whole island. Thus a step was taken in the great design of a union of all the British Isles under one crown; for Wales now contained only one independent kingdom, that of Gwynedd in the north. Though Henry II. thrice attacked it with little success, yet the other Welsh princes appear henceforth at the English Court as vassals. The connection of Wales with England had hitherto been slight. There were two brief invasions by Harold, in 1055 and 1063, a long series of piecemeal annexations by the Norman Marcher barons, and the settlement by Henry I. of a colony of Flemings in Pembrokeshire.

Scotland in 1157 had been forced to relinquish that hold on the three northern counties of England which, despite the

**Henry and  
Scotland.**

Battle of the Standard, had been maintained throughout Stephen's reign. Now in 1173 the Scotch king eagerly seconded the powerful league against Henry II. which was headed by Henry's own sons and joined by the King of France, the Count of



1218]

Flanders, and the barons of Normandy, England, Brittany, Gascony. The connection of all this with the murder of Becket was shown by Henry when, as he saw the disasters thickening around him, he hastened to the tomb of "the blessed martyr," and was scourged in penance before the shrine. That very day, men noted with awe, the invading host of William the Lion was utterly routed at Alnwick and the King of Scots captured. Even before Henry's arrival in England the Justiciar had defeated the rebel Earls of Norfolk, Leicester, and Derby.

By the Treaty of Falaise the King of Scots surrendered castles to Henry, did him homage at York, and acknowledged the English overlordship.

The crisis had shown the precariousness of the accidental tie which bound together dominions reaching from the Cheviots to the Pyrenees, and embracing so many different races. But it had also shown the complete confidence of the English nation in the Crown; it had revealed the existence of a strong group of loyal northern barons, descendants of Henry I.'s ministers and ancestors of the men who were forty years later to take the initiative in the movement of Magna Charta; and it had tested and approved the strength of that administrative system which this great king had been putting together with rare insight since his very accession.

Growth of Royal  
Power.

"Henceforth," proudly writes the royal treasurer, "let any one, how ever great a lord, learn that it is no light task to wrest the club from the hands of Hercules."

There was one cause which besides the sacrilege of 1170 opened the way for the peril of 1173. This was the king's relations with his own sons. He intended, doubtless, to divide out territories which he must have felt it hopeless to keep together. To secure the succession in England, Normandy, and Anjou, to his eldest son Henry, he had the coronation performed by the Archbishop of York in 1170. Geoffrey would be Duke of Brittany. Richard was to rule Poitou and Aquitaine. John was appointed Lord of Ireland in 1177. But the sons were not content to wait for their father's death. The three eldest joined the rebellion of 1173 against him; and when, during Richard's successful revolt against him in 1188, the old king discovered that John, his

youngest and best-loved child, had long been intriguing against him, the shock of this news, coming close upon the seizure of Anjou and Touraine by his despised and hated rival, Philip of France, and his humiliation before that rival and his own unnatural son, killed him in two days. The domestic history of his later days is a tragical one. A treacherous and revengeful wife; sons who made war on each other and on him, and brought the darkest accusations against him; the death of his eldest and third sons—in all this men traced a Divine vengeance for “the saint martyr of Canterbury,” for Henry’s own illicit amours, and for his ungovernable and blaspheming temper. But despite the

**Henry II.’s  
Reforms.**

failure of his foreign policy, the years from 1173 to 1189 continued the great series of measures by which the fabric of our Constitution was being built up. The “Assizes” united indissolubly the royal and the popular elements of justice replaced judicial combat by something not far from our trial by jury, encouraged the principle of elective representation, revived and reorganised the national militia. In 1170 a clean sweep was made of the corrupt local sheriffs, and royal officials substituted. In 1178 we begin to discern the appellate jurisdiction of the King’s Council, the germ of our Chancery courts. In 1188 two important advances are made in taxation, whereby the clergy are put under contribution, and personal property henceforth shares the burden with land. Few have been the kings whose career and experience were more varied; very few who could show such many-sided abilities and so strong and remarkable a personality; perhaps none who did more lasting good to their people than Henry Plantagenet.

**Richard I.,  
1189-1199.**

Under Richard I., a king who could hardly speak a word of English, whose whole stay in the country amounted only to a few months, who treated all English offices and royal possessions as so much salable property, it would seem as if there must come a check to the constitutional progress which had been

**Constitutional  
Progress.**

the direct fruit of alliance between the people and the Crown. But the royal ministers carried on the great work as thoroughly as before; they enlarged the self-governing powers of the local

courts of hundreds and shires; they had the grand juries for the assizes elected; they made assessment by elected representatives the regular rule for taxation both of personalty and of land, and thus left but one step to be taken towards the creation of representative Parliaments; they augmented the rights given in charters to boroughs; and when they let London organise itself under an elective mayor, they were permitting an advance in municipal independence such as (says Richard of Devizes) "neither Richard himself nor his father, Henry, would have allowed for a thousand times a thousand marks." Most of this wise policy, however, came after the downfall of William Longchamp, the Bishop of Ely. This man, a Norman by birth, and insolently contemptuous of the English, was left by Richard in 1189 to govern the kingdom. As Justiciar and Chancellor and Papal Legate his power was so great that only the most foolish arrogance in exercising it can explain his failure. He had bitterly offended not only his colleagues, but also the prelates, the barons, the Londoners, the mass of the nation, when in 1191 John, released from the oath of three years' residence abroad that Richard had imposed upon him, headed the movement against the "upstart" which ended in his dismissal and exile. Thus for the first time in our history had expression, however imperfect, been given to that most fruitful of all constitutional ideas, the responsibility of the king's ministers, not to the king alone, but to the nation also. But bully and braggart as Longchamp had been, he was at least loyal to his absent master. John—who in position, if not in official title, held the first place in England through 1192 to 1193—spent all his energies in plotting to wrest the crown from his brother, who was now, to the scandal of Christendom, held a captive on German soil. When the passionate remonstrances of Queen Eleanor, his mother, and the loyal generosity of the whole English nation in raising the enormous ransom, freed Richard in the spring of 1194, John was warned by his accomplice, Philip of France, with the significant notice, "Take care of yourself; the devil is loose." John, who was at the time openly warring against the Justiciar, was treated better than his deserts. In a brief stay of two months Richard settled the kingdom to his mind, and handed it over to Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury,

Papal Legate, who now became Justiciar as well. He was nephew of Ranulf Glanvil, who had succeeded in 1180 to the Justiciarship after Richard de Luci, and who had spent his life in Henry II.'s service. Nor was he unworthy to stand in this great line. It is true that, pressed himself by Richard's insatiable demands for money, he had to press hard upon the people; but to him was due most of the constitutional progress of the reign. His position of taskmaster encouraged at once the growth of ministerial responsibility and ministerial freedom of action. In 1198 the Great Council, led by St. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, flatly refused a royal demand for money: the sole precedent for such refusal was Becket's action in 1163. The Justiciar took the opportunity to resign, and Geoffrey FitzPeter, a great baron, succeeded him. During these last four and a half years of his career Richard was frittering away, in a petty warfare of vengeance against Philip, the powers of organisation and the fiery energy that, when exerted in Palestine, had almost availed to achieve the impossible, and restore life to the dead bones of the Frankish settlement in the East.

It is characteristic of the man that he received his death wound in trying to wrest treasure-trove from a recalcitrant vassal, and that on his death-bed he displayed a noble generosity and a sincere penitence. He was hardly in any sense an Englishman, but he had done much for England, by his exploits, by his choice of ministers, and indirectly by his absences and his very extortions.

Richard had at one time intended to make Arthur of Brittany his heir; but in the end he accepted John, whose election shows that the feudal rule of descent  
**The Reign of John, 1199-1216.** had not yet superseded the Old English practice of choosing for king whoever of the royal house seemed most suitable. Arthur, for whom no single voice was raised in England, had a strong party abroad, and, besides Brittany, held for a while Anjou, Maine, and Touraine.

But he was used as a cat's-paw by Philip, was taken prisoner by John, and disappeared—being no doubt murdered—in 1203. Upon this, Philip renewed the sentence of forfeiture which he had passed against John in the Court of Peers of France. By the end of 1204 the vast domains of Henry II.,

comprising three-fifths of modern France, were all lost, with the exception of Gascony and part of Guienne. Thus was England severed from Normandy; the tie, which had lasted 140 years, was broken. **Loss of Normandy.**

By it England had suffered much, but had gained even more, had gained a wider horizon, a European interest, and a breath of the daring, life-giving Norman spirit. Now that England had got all it could get, a continuance of the connection would have become a mis-alliance, a Mezentian union of the dead and the living. That this was so is shown by the striking fact that when the two countries now parted, only a handful of families were found who had lands in both. That is, the baronage on the two sides of the Channel had already become distinct. In fact, Henry I. had repeatedly confiscated the English estates of the most turbulent Norman barons. The feudal element had learned its lesson in 1174, and had now been drilled by fifty years of strict order: Henry II.'s scutage turned military feudatories into country gentlemen; families like the Beaumonts and the Montforts divided up their estates, the Norman to the elder branch, the English to the younger. From all these causes the baronage had become genuinely English. That this was so is proved above all by the confidence which the people began to repose in them, a confidence which makes the chief feature in constitutional history for the next 250 years, and which is nobly displayed and nobly justified on the page of Magna Charta.

The barons had felt a keen humiliation at the loss of the French provinces—less, perhaps, at the actual loss than at the contemptible manner of it. When first the danger arose, John had insolently de- **King, Barons, and Pope.** manded their feudal service, though he had carried out none of the solemn promises made at his coronation, but had seized their castles, and in several cases dishonoured their families in the foulest way. When the forces did assemble, thrice he plundered and dismissed them; or only took them across the sea to look on idly while the Norman fortresses fell. The conduct that was really due to suspicion and consciousness of inadequate means could in the barons' eyes show only as cowardice and imbecility. In 1213 they flatly refused to send a force abroad at all; now that Normandy was gone, Poitou was nothing to them. But the

decisive factor in the sum of the events which issued in Magna Charta was John's quarrel with the Church. On the very day of Hubert Walter's death in 1205, the younger monks of Christ Church, Canterbury, elected their sub-prior, and sent him off at once to Rome for Papal confirmation. But the king got wind of it, and promptly installed his own candidate in the estates of the See; and at the same time the bishops insisted that the right to elect an Archbishop of Canterbury was theirs. The Pope, the great Innocent III., saw his chance. He overrode the claims of all three parties, and appointed a member of his own Court, an English Cardinal resident at Rome, Stephen Langton. No better man could have been chosen. It was natural therefore that John should refuse to receive him, and, when punished by an Interdict in 1208 being laid on the kingdom, should retaliate by outlawing the bishops and confiscating Church property. The next step was the solemn excommunication of the king; and the final one, a Bull of deposition. The closing of the churches, the hushing of the bells and services, the cessation of the sacraments, the severance of himself from the Church like a leper, the absolving of his subjects from their allegiance, the commission to King Philip to invade England and wrest the kingdom from "a son of perdition"—against all these John only hardened his heart. But when a crazy fanatic prophesied that on Ascension Day, 1213, John would have lost the crown, the king showed all the cowardice of a tyrant and the superstitiousness of a blasphemer, and grovelled in abject submission before Pandulf, the very Papal Legate who, in 1208, had been met only with a threat that "he should dance upon air" if he entered the royal presence again. John now gave up his kingdom to the Pope, to receive it back as a tributary and a vassal, and accepted Langton as archbishop. Langton entered England, and the key to the whole situation was found. John had outraged the barons, had desecrated the Church, had despoiled and oppressed the people. But the barons had looked on while the Church had suffered; and the barons had based their own resistance upon technicalities of feudal tenure, not on broad and national grounds. To bring out a mutual confidence between the three classes, and to fix this on a constitutional basis was the mission of the new archbishop. At a Council in St. Paul's,

1216]

25th of August, 1213, he produced the Charter of Henry I., of which the Great Charter itself is but an expanded copy.

Under this banner the rebellion was organised while John was abroad in Poitou, and in November, 1214, a month after he returned, the baronage had met at St. Edmunds and taken a solemn oath to exact from him a Charter on such a model. In vain John struggled to break up their party, to buy over the Church, to invoke the protection of the Pope. The toils closed around him. At Easter an armed host of some 10,000 men met at Stamford; on 24th May they entered London amid rejoicings. Hereupon the few barons who still adhered to the king—mostly members of the old feudal group, men like Earl Warenne and Ranulf, Earl of Chester—deserted him; and John, with rage and treachery in his heart, had to yield at last. The Great Charter was signed at Runnymede, 15th June, 1215. It is a misunderstanding to regard the Charter either as containing

*Magna Charta.*

new principles or as terminating a struggle. On the contrary, its character is eminently conservative, setting up "the laws of Henry I." as its standard. At the same time "confirmation of the Charter" becomes the rallying-cry of the next three generations, and the constitutional progress up to 1340 is little more than the working out of the Charter's main clauses.

John survived by sixteen months this day of his humiliation. In that brief space were crowded events well worthy to form the last scenes of Shakespeare's play—the fiery energy of the king, his victories over his enemies in detail, the Pope's excommunication of the rebels and suspension of the archbishop, the barons' desperate transfer of the crown to Prince Louis of France, the blind and savage vengeance exercised by John's foreign soldiers, who swept to and fro through the land, and whose marches were a track of flames and blood, till the sands of the Wash ruined John's army, and the monk of Swinstead—so ran the popular account—sacrificed himself to become the instrument of God's wrath upon the tyrant.

At the accession of Stephen the Church presented the appearance of a great secular corporation. Roger of Salisbury was still justiciar, his son Roger chancellor, his nephew Nigel treasurer and Bishop of Ely, and another nephew,

W. H. HUTTON.  
The Church  
During the  
Anarchy.



Alexander, was Bishop of Lincoln. It was to Roger that Stephen chiefly owed his crown, and the support of the clergy was acknowledged in the new king's early charters. When the civil war broke out, it was the foolish arrest of the great prelates that threw the country into confusion, suspended all legal and constitutional administration, and gave Matilda her little day of triumph. The Church held the balance between parties, and the pendulum swung as she directed. Individual Churchmen stood out among the chaos of those "nineteen winters" as directors and guides, though often blind leaders of the blind. Henry of Blois, Stephen's brother and Bishop of Winchester, a stern Cistercian of unbending fidelity to the independent interests of the Church, endeavoured to be an arbitrator, but was little more than a changeable partisan. Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, was a consistent supporter of Matilda, but his influence was overshadowed by the great Bishop of Winchester. He gathered round him, nevertheless, a circle of students and thinkers who gave England fame in Europe, even in the midst of her darkest gloom at home. And the reign of Stephen witnessed an extraordinary extension of monasticism which was to change the whole features of Northern England. The northern shires had not

**Growth of  
Monasticism.**

recovered from their harrying by the Conqueror; even to 1130 the land lay waste round York for a breadth of sixty miles. It was the monks, and chiefly the Cistercians, who turned the wilderness into a fruitful field. "In the short time that Stephen bore the title of king," says William, the Augustinian canon of Newburgh, "there arose in England many more dwellings of the servants and handmaids of God than had risen in the whole century past." Twenty religious houses in Yorkshire, nineteen in Lincolnshire, many more in other shires, were founded in the midst of the anarchy—"God's castles," says the chronicler, "in which the servants of the true anointed King do keep watch, and His young are exercised in war against spiritual wickedness." At the same time, too, the one distinctively English order was created. Gilbert of Sempringham, a Lincolnshire knight, established a society to which both men and women were admitted, and which spread over England with great rapidity. His work was educational as well as spiritual, and William of Newburgh

1216]

says "he bears away the palm from all who have applied their religious labours to the teaching and training of women."

While the work of the Church was thus progressing, and the terror and confusion of the times had suspended the sessions of the ordinary courts of the realm, it was natural that the Church

**Extension of the  
Ecclesiastical  
Courts.**

courts, administered by men more and more trained in canonical and civil law, should encroach upon the province of the secular jurisdiction. Suits between clerk and layman concerning land, matters of criminal issue in which a clerk was interested as criminal or as injured, debts in which there was a pledging by oath, and the like, fell wholly into the hands of the ecclesiastical courts. Thus when the land was again at peace, and Henry the Angevin sat on the throne of his grandfather with a settled aim to make all men equal before one system of law and government, a conflict between Church and State was inevitable. Foremost among the scholars of Archbishop Theobald had been one Thomas of London, the son of Gilbert surnamed Becket, a merchant of Rouen who had settled in London and become sheriff. A bright lad, of keen wit and pure life, he had risen to be Archdeacon of Canterbury several

**Thomas Becket.**

years before Stephen died, and he was commended to his successor as "companion of his counsels," and became chancellor in 1154. The two young men became fast friends; "when business was over they would play together like boys of an age; in hall, in church, they sat together, or rode out. . . . Sometimes the king rode on horseback into the hall where the chancellor sat at meat; sometimes, bow in hand, returning from hunting or on his way to the chase; sometimes he would drink and depart when he had seen the chancellor. Sometimes jumping over the table, he would sit down and eat with him. Never in Christian times were there two men more of a mind or better friends." So writes the friend and biographer of Thomas, William Fitzstephen, who was with him to the end of his chequered life. Thomas aided, if he did not guide, the great law reforms by which Henry inaugurated his reign; he went on embassies, he heard causes, he led knights in the field. But when Theobald died, and the king insisted that the man he knew and loved best

should sit on the throne of Augustine, he "put off" the deacon," and became, at a step, the champion of the rights and the claims of the Church. In October, 1163, at a council at Westminster, the king demanded that clerks accused of great crimes should be tried in his courts. He was not without the support of canonists and civilians, and before long he won to his side the majority of the timid and time-serving bishops. In the constitutions of Clarendon, January, 1164, he set out the claim at length, with added restraints on appeals to Rome, and on the trial of civil suits concerning lands and debts. The archbishop stood firm. He was already engaged in a purification of the Church; in his own diocese "he plucked up, pulled down, scattered, and rooted out whatever he found planted amiss in the garden of the Lord." He was anxious, like the king, to purge the Church of abuses; but it was an internal reformation that he designed, and he would not call in the secular arm. Nine months passed, and there was no prospect of agreement. The king then caused Becket to be tried in a council of Northampton on charges bearing only indirectly on the questions in dispute. After a stormy scene the archbishop appealed to Rome, and in a few days left England. For the next six years he resided in France, and one attempt after another to make peace between Church and State failed. Henry persecuted and banished Becket's kinsfolk and supporters. Becket excommunicated those who invaded and plundered his see. Pope and anti-pope bid for the English king's support, and Alexander III. now censured and now praised the vehemence of the Church's champion. As the years went on Becket, at Pontigny and at Sens, gathered round him a circle like that of an exiled monarch: the learned men of Europe corresponded with him, and the Church in all lands watched him as a gladiator in the arena. At last Henry yielded, promised to annul the constitutions, and receive the archbishop to the kiss of peace. On December 1, 1170, Becket landed at Sandwich; on the 29th he was murdered in his own cathedral. Though he had been everywhere received by the acclamations of the people, the bishops who had been of the king's party had still refused to submit to his authority, and their complaints had drawn from the king the passionate cry, too hastily interpreted, "I have nourished

1216]

and promoted in my realm sluggish and wretched knaves who are faithless to their lord, and suffer him to be tricked thus infamously by a low clerk." Thomas of Canterbury met his death at the hands of four reckless knights with a fortitude that astonished the timid monks who surrounded him. "I am ready," he said, "to die for my Lord, that in my blood the Church may obtain liberty and peace. But in the name of Almighty God I forbid you to hurt my people, whether clerk or lay." The result of his death was the complete submission of the king. The "customs" were entirely given up, and clerks and offenders against them were left to ecclesiastical tribunals. No other issue was possible. The king was involved in the horror which thrilled through Europe at the murder. Becket all through his years of struggle had been adored by the people of England; his praises were sung by Garnier, the poet of the poor; his fellow-citizens of London made him their patron; obscure writers in distant lands told of his fight for the Church; crusading knights founded a new order in his honour, and in Iceland a saga embodied the story of his life. More than this: himself the first man born on English soil who had worn the mitre of metropolitan since William's Conquest, he stood out for centuries as the great national hero. He was canonised in 1173. No saint was so popular an object of veneration; his memory was closely embedded in the very heart of the national life.

**Saint Thomas of  
Canterbury.**

It must always be remembered that the forces at the back of St. Thomas represented not only the respect which men feel for a bold fight for principle, but also that blind struggle against the hideous punishments of the age, of which the assertion of ecclesiastical privilege, covering widows and orphans as well as clerks and those who injured them, was a natural expression.

The reformation that Becket and Henry designed was far from being accomplished. Satirists pointed to the babies whose promotion in the Church was secured before they could speak. Infants in cradles, they complain, are made archdeacons, that out of the mouths of babes and sucklings may be perfected praise. Children at the breast are set to dispense the

**Scandals in the  
Church.**

sacraments. Boys are made bishops at the age when an apple is dearer to them than a dozen churches. Their training is only in the things of this world. They are sent to Paris, where they learn every vice: and they return to England only to hawk and to hunt. The bishops who won their sees by secular work or mean intrigue made it no care to labour in the Lord's vineyard. "What bishop," says Giraldus, the shrewd Welsh archdeacon, "fulfils the canonical description of the true pastor even in small things?" Much of this must be set down to literary exaggeration: it was a common recreation of ecclesiastical satirists to throw stones at bishops, and little did the bishops mind it. But there are more than enough instances in the works of the baldest of annalists to show that the Church was in far from wholesome condition. It is recorded among the virtues of St. Thomas that he would actually descend from his horse to minister the sacrament of confirmation. It was a wonder to the beholders when St. Hugh of Avalon, Bishop of Lincoln, washed with his own hands the sores of lepers. Quarrels for precedence took up much of the time of those whose hearts should have been set on things above. The primates contended for the dignity of their sees. "Verily," says William of Newburgh, "that apostolic rule 'in honour preferring one another' is so disregarded by the bishops of our time that they, laying aside pastoral solicitude, contend with one another for dignity both in obstinacy and emptiness." Thus in 1176, when a Papal Legate held council in London, "The Archbishop of York, being arrived the earlier, took possession of the chief seat, claiming the same as his own. The Archbishop of Canterbury, however, like a man who has sustained an injury, refused to take the lower room, and solemnly proclaimed his grievance in the matter of the seat that had been taken; but his attendants, being more fiercely jealous of his dignity, proceeded from a simple strife of words to a brawl. The Archbishop of York (for the contrary party was the stronger) was driven with shame from the place he had so prematurely taken, and showed to the Legate his torn cope as a mark of the violence used towards him; and he declared that he would summon the Archbishop of Canterbury with his gang before the Holy See. Thus, while the metropolitans battled, all business was thrown athwart, and the council was not

celebrated, but dispersed; and all those who had been summoned, and had come together to hold council, returned to their own homes." The Church under Richard and John was at once contentious and secularised. Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury, was a shrewd financier and an honourable conscientious statesman, but as a prelate he is noted chiefly for his quarrels with his chapter. Quarrels such as his, and those of Hugh of Nunant at Coventry, Savaric of Wells, and Geoffrey of York are, however, not always proofs of the secular arrogance of bishops. They show, more often, the claims of the great monastic houses to be exempt from all episcopal governance, and to be subject only to the Roman Curia. These claims, striven for with varying success during the next century, were slowly but surely won, and the greatest difficulty of the Church in England came to be, before the House of Anjou had ceased to rule, that independence of monasteries which made firm governance impossible, and arrayed monks and bishops in opposite camps, till the bishops themselves yielded to the tide, and handed themselves over, in the fifteenth century, as subservient vassals of the Papacy.

But it is easy to paint too dark a picture. There is light here, as elsewhere, if we will look for it. It may be that the Crusades were fruitless; <sup>True</sup> Church Reformers. but the preaching of them at least held up before men a high standard of sacrifice and devotion. And few prelates but at one time or another gave their substance, if not their hearts, to the Holy War. Nor is there anything more touching in the history of the Middle Ages than the fervour with which bishop and priest, clerk and layman, threw away their lives to succour their brethren in the East. And at home men like St. Hugh stand out as models of sagacity, clear-sightedness, genuine piety. The man who could dare such kings as Henry II. and Richard I., and beat them with their own weapons, could shock the dignitaries of the Church by fixing his teeth in a precious relic. Yet no man more gentle or more reverent ever breathed. Later, when England fell under the rule of the vilest of her kings, an Englishman and an English Primate could lead the barons and the people to the freedom that was won for all time.

During the earlier years of John's reign, so long as Hubert Walter lived, the king kept peace with the Church; but no sooner was he dead (1205) than the king was revealed as an unchecked tyrant. The monks of Christ Church elected to the primacy their own sub-prior; the king nominated John, Bishop of Norwich. The Pope decided against both, and made the deputation of monks, then in Rome, elect Stephen Langton, an English scholar of distinction. The king refused to accept him, expelled the monks of Canterbury, and seized their possessions. Innocent III. threatened, and at last declared, an interdict. The distress caused by this may be exaggerated. The formal suspension of the Sacraments was subject to many exceptions, and at the worst the observance of it would not reduce the services below the model of modern Protestant communities. But the land was in confusion; every man did what was right in his own eyes; law was at an end; and though the king held out for a time even under personal excommunication, at length he was forced to yield. He chose an extraordinary method of submission. In surrendering his crown to the Pope, and receiving it again as a feudatory of the Holy See, pledged to "defend the patrimony of St. Peter, and especially the kingdoms of England and Ireland," he at one stroke undid the policy of his forefathers on the English throne. From our point of view the most significant result of all this struggle was the way in which the Church was now brought forward as the champion of the people. When king and barons plunged again into war, it was Stephen Langton, patriot as well as prelate, who produced to the constitutionalists the Charter of Henry I., on which their demands should be based, and from which Magna Charta sprang. "Quod Ecclesia Anglicana libera sit" is the first article of the Great Charter, and the freedom which allowed the chapters to choose their own bishops was the type and pattern of the liberty asserted for the whole land.

THE Normans when they invaded England were in one important particular a less civilised race than were those English whom they came to subjugate. We may say with some certainty

**F. W. MAITLAND.**  
**English Law under**  
**Norman Rule.**



that they had no written laws. A century and a half ago a king of the Franks had been compelled to cede a large province to a horde of Scandinavian pirates. The pirates had settled down as lords of a conquered people; they had gradually adopted the religion, the language, and the civilisation (such as it was) of the vanquished; they had become Frenchmen. They may have paid some reverence to the written laws of the Frankish race, to the very ancient *Lex Salica* and the capitularies of Merovingian and Carlovingian kings. But these were fast becoming obsolete, and neither the dukes of the Normans, nor their nominal overlords, the kings of the Franks or French, could issue written dooms such as those which Canute was publishing in England. Some excellent traditions of a far-off past, of the rule of Charles the Great, the invaders could bring with them to England; and these, transplanted into the soil of a subject kingdom, could burst into new life and bear new fruit—the great record that we call “*Domesday Book*” is a splendid firstfruit—but written laws they had none.

To all seeming, the Conqueror meant that his English subjects should keep their own old laws. Merely duke of the Normans, he was going to be king in England, and he was not dissatisfied with those royal rights which, according to his version of the story, had descended to him from King Edward. About a few points he legislated. For example, the lives of his followers were to be protected by the famous murder-fine. If a Frenchman was found slain, and the slayer was not produced, a heavy sum was to be exacted from the district in which the crime was done. The establishment of a presumption that every murdered man is a Frenchman until the contrary is proved—a presumption highly advantageous to the king’s exchequer—gave rise in later days to the curious process known as “the presentment of Englishry.” The hundred had to pay the fine unless the kinsfolk of the dead man would testify to his English birth. But this by the way. William had also to regulate the scope of that trial by battle which the Normans brought with them, and in so doing he tried to deal equitably with both Normans and English. Also it was necessary that he who had come hither as in some sort the champion of Roman orthodoxy should mark off the sphere of spiritual from that of temporal law by stricter lines than

had yet been drawn in England. Much, again—though by no general law—he altered in the old military system, which had lately shown itself to be miserably ineffectual. Dealing out the forfeited lands among his barons, he could stipulate for a force of armoured and mounted knights. Some other changes he would make; but in the main he was content that the English should live under their old law, the law that now bore the blessed Edward's name.

And so again when on the death of Rufus—from Rufus himself we get and we expect no laws—  
Law under  
Henry I. Henry seized the crown, and was compelled to purchase adherents by granting a charter full of all manner of promises, made to all manner of people—the promise by which he hoped to win the hearts of Englishmen was that he would restore to them Edward's law with those amendments that the Conqueror had made in it. Henry himself, great as a governor, was no great legislator. A powerful central tribunal, which is also an exacting financial bureau, an "exchequer," began to take definite shape under the management of his expert ministers; but very few new laws were published. The most characteristic legal exploits of the Norman period are the attempts made by various private persons to reconstruct "the law of St. Edward." They translate some of the old English dooms into Latin as best they can—a difficult task, for the English language is rapidly taking a new shape. They modify the old dooms to suit a new age. They borrow from foreign sources—from the canon law of the Catholic Church, from Frankish capitularies, now and again from the Roman law-books. But in Henry I.'s reign they still regard the old English dooms, the law of King Edward, as the core of the law that prevails in England. They leave us wondering how much practical truth there is in what they say; whether the ancient criminal tariffs that they transcribe are really observed; whether the Frenchmen who preside in court pay much attention to the words of Canute, even when those words have been turned into Latin or into French. Still, their efforts assure us that there has been rather a dislocation than a complete break in the legal history of England; also that the Frenchmen have not introduced much new law of a sufficiently definite kind to be set down in writing.

As yet the great bulk of all the justice that was done, was done by local courts, by those shire-moots and hundred-moots which the Conqueror and Henry I. had maintained as part of the ancient order, and by the newer seignorial courts which were springing up in every village. The king's own court was but a court for the protection of royal rights, a court for the causes of the king's barons, and an ultimate tribunal at which a persistent litigant might perhaps arrive when justice had failed him everywhere else. Had it continued to be no more than this, the Old English law, slowly adapting itself to changed circumstances, might have cast off its archaisms and become the law for after-times, law to be written and spoken in English words. Far more probably "St. Edward's law" would have split into a myriad local customs, and then at some future time Englishmen must have found relief from intolerable confusion in the eternal law of Rome. Neither of these two things happened, because under Henry II. the king's own court flung open its doors to all manner of people, ceased to be for judicial purposes an occasional assembly of warlike barons, became a bench of professional justices, appeared periodically in all the counties of England under the guise of the Justices in Eyre. Then begins the process which makes the custom of the king's court the common law of England. Ever since the Conquest the king's court had been in a very true sense a French court. It had been a French-speaking court, a court whose members had been of French race, and had but slowly been learning to think of themselves as Englishmen. Its hands had been very free. It could not, if it would, have administered the old English written laws in their native purity: for one thing they were unintelligible; for another thing in the twelfth century they had become barbarous—they dealt with crime in a hopelessly old-fashioned way. On the other part, there was, happily, no written Norman code, and the king did not mean to be in England the mere duke he had been in Normandy. And so the hands of his court were very free; it could be a law unto itself. Many old English institutions it preserved, in particular those institutions of public law which were advantageous to the king—the king, for instance, could insist that the sheriffs were sheriffs, and not hereditary *vicomtes*—but the private law, law of land tenure, law of possession, of contract, of procedure,

which the court develops in the course of the twelfth century, is exceedingly like a *coutume* from Northern France. Hundreds of years will elapse before anyone tries to write about it in English; and when at length this is done, the English will be an English in which every important noun, every accurate term, is of French origin.

We may say a little more about the language of our law, for it is a not uninteresting topic. From the  
Legal  
Language.
 Conquest onwards until the year 1731 the solemnest language of our law was neither French nor English, but Latin. Even in the Anglo-Saxon time, though English was the language in which laws were published, and causes were pleaded, Latin was the language in which the kings, with Italian models before them, made grants of land to the churches and the thegns. In 1066 the learned men of both races could write and speak to each other in Latin. We shall be pretty safe in saying that anyone who could read and write at all could read and write Latin. As to French, it was as yet little better than a vulgar dialect of Latin, a language in which men might speak, but not a language in which they would write anything, except perhaps a few songs. The two tongues which the Conqueror used for laws, charters, and writs, were Latin and English. But Latin soon gets the upper hand, and becomes for a while the one written language of the law. In the kings' Chancery they write nothing but Latin, and it is in Latin that the judgments of the kings' courts are recorded. This, as already said, is so until the year 1731; to substitute English for Latin as the language in which the king's writs and patents and charters shall be expressed, and the doings of the law-courts shall be preserved, requires a statute of George II.'s day.

Meanwhile there had been many and great changes. Late in the twelfth or early in the thirteenth century French was beginning to make itself a language in which not only songs and stories but legal documents could be written. About the middle of the thirteenth century ordinances and statutes that are written in French begin to appear. Just for one moment English puts in a claim to equality. Henry III. "*þurȝ Godes fulturne king on Engleneloande*" issued one proclamation in English. But this claim was either belated or premature. Under Edward I. French, though it cannot expel Latin from

the records of litigation, becomes the language in which laws are published and law-books are written. It continues to be the language of the statute-book until the end of the Middle Ages. Under Henry VII. English at length becomes the speech in which English lawgivers address their subjects, though some two hundred and fifty years must yet pass away before it will win that field in which Latin is securely entrenched.

As the oral speech of litigants and their advisers, French has won a splendid victory. In the king's own court it must prevail from the Conquest onwards, but in the local courts a great deal of English must long have been spoken. Then, however, under Henry II. began that centralising movement which we have already noticed. The jurisprudence of a French-speaking court became the common law, the measure of all rights and duties, and it was carried throughout the land by the journeying justices. In the thirteenth century men when they plead or when they talk about law, speak French; the professional lawyer writes in French and thinks in French. Some power of speaking a decent French seems to have been common among all classes of men, save the very poorest; men spoke it who had few, if any, drops of foreign blood in their veins. Then in 1362, when the prolonged wars between England and France had begun, a patriotic statute endeavoured to make English instead of French the spoken tongue of the law-courts. But this came too late; we have good reason for thinking that it was but tardily obeyed, and, at any rate, lawyers went on writing about law in French. Gradually in the sixteenth century their French went to the bad, and they began to write in English; for a long time past they had been thinking and speaking in English. But it was an English in which almost all the technical terms were of French origin. And so it is at the present day. How shall one write a single sentence about law without using some such word as "debt," "contract," "heir," "trespass," "pay," "money," "court," "judge," "jury"? But all these words have come to us from the French. In all the world-wide lands where English law prevails, homage is done daily to William of Normandy and Henry of Anjou.

What Henry did in the middle of the twelfth century was of the utmost importance, though we might find ourselves in the midst of obsolete technicalities were we to endeavour to

describe it at length. Speaking briefly, we may say that he concentrated the whole system of English justice round a court of judges professionally expert in the law. He could thus win money—in the Middle Ages no one did justice for nothing—and he could thus win power; he could control, and he could starve, the courts of the feudatories. In offering the nation his royal justice, he offered a strong and sound commodity. Very soon we find very small people—yeomen, peasants—giving the go-by to the old local courts and making their way to Westminster Hall, to plead there about their petty affairs. We may allow that in course of time this concentrating process went much too far. In Edward I.'s day the competence of the local courts in civil causes was hemmed within a limit of forty shillings, a limit which at first was fairly wide, but became ever narrower as the value of money fell, until in the last century no one could exact any debt that was not of trifling amount without bringing a costly action in one of the courts at Westminster. But the first stages of the process did unmixed good—they gave us a common law.

King Henry and his able ministers came just in time—a little later would have been too late: English law would have been unified, but it would have been Romanised. We have been wont to boast, perhaps too loudly, of the pure "Englishry" of our common law. This has not been all pure gain. Had we "received" the Roman jurisprudence as our neighbours received it, we should have kept out of many a bad mess through which we have plunged. But to say nothing of the political side of the matter, of the absolute monarchy which Roman law has been apt to bring in its train, it is probably well for us and for the world at large that we have stumbled forwards in our empirical fashion, blundering into wisdom. The moral glow known to the virtuous school-boy who has not used the "crib" that was ready to his hand, we may allow ourselves to feel; and we may hope for the blessing which awaits all those who have honestly taught themselves anything.

In a few words we must try to tell a long story. On the Continent of Europe Roman law had never perished. After the barbarian invasions it was still the "personal law" of the conquered

**Roman Law  
in Mediæval  
Europe.**

provincials. The Franks, Lombards, and other victorious tribes lived under their old Germanic customs, while the vanquished lived under the Roman law. In course of time the personal law of the bulk of the inhabitants became the territorial law of the country where they lived. The Roman law became once more the general law of Italy and of Southern France ; but in so doing it lost its purity, it became a debased and vulgarised Roman law, to be found rather in traditional custom than in the classical texts, of which very little was known. Then, at the beginning of the twelfth century, came a great change. A law-school at Bologna began to study and to teach that Digest in which Justinian had preserved the wisdom of the great jurists of the golden age. A new science spread outwards from Bologna. At least wherever the power of the emperor extended, Roman law had—so men thought—a claim to rule. The emperors, though now of German race, were still the Roman emperors, and the laws of their ancestors were to be found in Justinian's books. But further, the newly discovered system—for we may without much untruth say that it was newly discovered—seemed so reasonable that it could not but affect the development of law in countries, such as France and England, which paid no obedience to the emperors.

And just at this time a second great system of cosmopolitan jurisprudence was taking shape. For centuries past the Catholic Church had been Canon Law. slowly acquiring a field of jurisdiction that was to be all her own, and for the use of the ecclesiastical tribunals a large body of law had come into being, consisting of the canons published by Church Councils and the decretal epistles—genuine and forged—of the Popes. Various collections of these were current, but in the middle of the twelfth century they were superseded by the work of Gratian, a monk of Bologna. He called it "The Concordance of Discordant Canons," but it soon became known everywhere as the *Decretum*. And by this time the Popes were ever busy in pouring out decretal letters, sending them into all corners of the western world. Authoritative collections of these "decretals" were published, and the ecclesiastical lawyer (the "canonist" or "decretist") soon had at his command a large mass of written law comparable to that which the Roman lawyer



(the "civilian" or "legist") was studying. A *Corpus Juris Canonici* begins to take its place beside the *Corpus Juris Civilis*. Very often the same man had studied both; he was a "doctor of both laws;" and, indeed, the newer system had borrowed largely from the older; it had borrowed its form, its spirit, and a good deal of its matter also.

The canonical jurisprudence of the Italian doctors became the ecclesiastical law of the western world. From all local courts, wherever they might be, there was an appeal to the ultimate tribunal at Rome. But the temporal law of every country felt the influence of the new learning. Apparently we might lay down some such rule as this—that where the attack is longest postponed, it is most severe. In the thirteenth century the Parliament of Paris began the work of harmonising and rationalising the provincial customs of Northern France, and this it did by Romanising them. In the sixteenth century, after "the revival of letters," the Italian jurisprudence took hold of Germany, and swept large portions of the old national law before it. Wherever it finds a weak, because an uncentralised, system of justice, it wins an easy triumph. To Scotland it came late; but it came to stay.

To England it came early. Very few are the universities which can boast of a school of Roman law so old as that of Oxford. In the troubled days of our King Stephen, when the Church was urging new claims against the feeble State, Archbishop Theobald imported from Italy one Vacarius, a Lombard lawyer, who lectured here on Roman law, and wrote a big book that may still be read. Very soon after this Oxford had a flourishing school of civil and canon law. Ever since William the Conqueror had solemnly sanctioned the institution of special ecclesiastical courts, it had been plain that in those courts the law of a Catholic Church, not of a merely English Church, must prevail; also that this law would be in the main Italian law. In the next century, as all know, Henry and Becket fell out as to the definition of the province that was to be left to the ecclesiastical courts. The battle was drawn; neither combatant had gained all that he wanted. Thenceforward until the Protestant Reformation, and indeed until later than that, a border warfare between the two sets of courts was always simmering. Victory naturally inclined to

**Roman Law  
in England.**

1218]

those tribunals which had an immediate control of physical force, but still the sphere that was left to the canonists will seem to our eyes very ample. It comprehended not only the enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline, and the punishment—by spiritual censure, and, in the last resort, by excommunication—of sins left unpunished by temporal law, but also the whole topic of marriage and divorce, those last dying wills and testaments which were closely connected with dying confessions, and the administration of the goods of intestates. Why to this day do we couple “Probate” with “Divorce”? Because in the Middle Ages both of these matters belonged to “the courts Christian.” Why to “Probate” and “Divorce” do we add “Admiralty”? Because the civilians—and in England the same man was usually both canonist and civilian—succeeded, though at a comparatively late time, in taking to themselves the litigation that concerned things done on the high seas, those high seas whence no jury could be summoned. So for the canonist there was plenty of room in England; and there was some room for the civilian: he was very useful as a diplomatist.

But we were speaking of our English common law, the law of our ordinary temporal courts, and of the influence upon it of the new Italian but cosmopolitan jurisprudence; and we must confess that for a short while, from the middle of the twelfth to the middle of the thirteenth century, this influence was powerful. The amount of foreign law that was actually borrowed has been underrated and overrated; we could not estimate it without descending to details. Some great maxims and a few more concrete rules were appropriated, but on the whole what was taken was logic, method, spirit, rather than matter. We may see the effect of this influence very plainly in a treatise on the Laws of England which comes to us from the last years of Henry II. It has been ascribed to Henry’s Chief Justiciar—Viceroy, we may say—Ranulf Glanvill; and whether or no it comes from his pen (he was a layman and a warrior), it describes the practice of the court over which he presided. There are very few sentences in it which we can trace to any Roman book, and yet in a sense the whole book is Roman. We look back from it to a law-book written in Henry I.’s time, and we can hardly believe that only some seventy years divide the two. The

Glanvill.

one can at this moment be read and understood by anyone who knows a little of mediæval Latin and a little of English law; the other will always be dark to the most learned scholars. The gulf between them looks like that between logic and caprice, between reason and unreason. And then from the middle of the thirteenth century we have a much greater and better book than Glanvill's. Its author we know as

**Bracton.** Bracton, though his name really was Henry of Bratton. He was an ecclesiastic, an arch-

deacon, but for many years he was one of the king's justices. He had read a great deal of the Italian jurisprudence, chiefly in the works of that famous doctor, Azo of Bologna. Thence he had obtained his idea of what a law-book should be, of how law should be arranged and stated; thence also he borrowed maxims and some concrete rules; with these he can fill up the gaps in our English system. But he lets us see that not much more can now be done in the way of romanisation. Ever since Henry II.'s time the king's court has been hard at work amassing precedents, devising writs, and commenting upon them. Bracton himself has laboriously collected five hundred decisions from the mile-long rolls of the court, and uses them as his authorities. For him English law is already "case law"; a judgment is a precedent. While as yet the science of the civilians was a somewhat unpractical science, while as yet they had not succeeded in bringing the old classical texts into close contact with the facts of mediæval life, the king's court of professional justices—the like of which was hardly to be found in any foreign land, in any unconquered land—had been rapidly evolving a common law for England, establishing a strict and formal routine of procedure, and tying the hands of all subsequent judges. From Bracton's day onwards Roman law exercises but the slightest influence on the English common law, and such influence as it exercises is rather by way of repulsion than by way of attraction. English law at this early period had absorbed so much Romanism that it could withstand all future attacks, and pass scathless even through the critical sixteenth century.

It may be convenient, however, to pause at this point in the development of our judicial institutions, in order to trace the history of our legal procedure.

1216]

For a long time past Englishmen have been proud of their trial by jury, proud to see the nations of Europe imitating as best they might this <sup>The History of Trial by Jury.</sup> “palladium of English liberties,” this “bulwark of the British Constitution.” Their pride, if in other respects it be reasonable, need not be diminished by any modern discoveries of ancient facts, even though they may have to learn that in its origin trial by jury was rather French than English, rather royal than popular, rather the livery of conquest than a badge of freedom. They have made it what it is; and what it is is very different from what it was. The story is a long and a curious one.

Let us try to put before our eyes a court of the twelfth century; it may be a county court, or a hundred-court, or a court held by some great <sup>Legal Forms in the Twelfth Century.</sup> baron for his tenants. It is held in the open air—perhaps upon some ancient moot-hill, which ever since the times of heathenry has been the scene of justice. An officer presides over it—the sheriff, the sheriff’s bailiff, the lord’s steward. But all or many of the free landowners of the district are bound to attend it; they owe “suit” to it, they are its suitors, they are its doomsmen; it is for them, and not for the president, “to find the dooms.” He controls the procedure, he issues the mandates, he pronounces the sentence; but when the question is what the judgment shall be, he bids the suitors find a doom. All this is very ancient, and look where we will in Western Europe we may find it. But as yet we have not found the germ of trial by jury. These doomsmen are not “judges of fact.” There is no room for any judges of fact. If of two litigants the one contradicts the other flatly, if the plain “You did” of the one is met by the straightforward “You lie” of the other, here is a problem that man cannot solve. He is unable as yet to weigh testimony against testimony, to cross-examine witnesses, to piece together the truth out of little bits of evidence. He has recourse to the supernatural. He adjudges that one or other of the two parties is to prove his case by an appeal to God.

The judgment precedes the proof. The proof consists, not in a successful attempt to convince your judges of the truth of your assertion, but in the <sup>The Oath.</sup> performance of a task that they have imposed upon you: if

you perform it, God is on your side. The modes of proof are two, oaths and ordeals. In some cases we may see a defendant allowed to swear away a charge by his own oath. More frequently he will have to bring with him oath-helpers—in later days they are called “compurgators”—and when he has sworn successfully, each of these oath-helpers in turn will swear “By God that oath is clean and true.” The doomsmen have decreed how many oath-helpers, and of what quality, he must bring. A great deal of their traditional legal lore consists in rules about this matter; queer arithmetical rules which teach how the oath of one thegn is as weighty as the oaths of six ceorls, and the like. Sometimes they require that the oath-helpers shall be kinsmen of the principal swearer, and so warn us against any rationalism which would turn these oath-helpers into “witnesses to character,” and probably tell us of the time when the bond of blood was so strong that a man’s kinsfolk were answerable for his misdeeds. A very easy task this oath with oath-helpers may seem in our eyes. It is not so easy as it looks. Ceremonial rules must be strictly observed; a set form of words must be pronounced; a slip, a stammer, will spoil all, and the adversary will win his cause. Besides, it is common knowledge that those who perjure themselves are often struck dead, or reduced to the stature of dwarfs, or find that they cannot remove their hands from the relics that they have profaned.

But when crime is laid to a man’s charge he will not always be allowed to escape with oaths. Very likely  
**The Ordeal.** he will be sent to the ordeal. The ordeal is conceived as “the judgment of God.” Of heathen origin it well may be, but long ago the Christian Church has made it her own, has prescribed a solemn ritual for the consecration of those instruments—the fire, the water—which will reveal the truth. The water in the pit is adjured to receive the innocent and to reject the guilty. He who sinks is safe, he who floats is lost. The red-hot iron one pound in weight must be lifted and carried three paces. The hand that held it is then sealed up in a cloth. Three days afterwards the seal is broken. Is the hand clean or is it foul? that is the dread question. A blister “as large as half a walnut” is fatal. How these tests worked in practice we do not know. We seldom get stories about them save when, as now and again will happen, the

1216]

local saint interferes and performs a miracle. We cannot but guess that it was well to be good friends with the priest when one went to the ordeal.

Then the Norman conquerors brought with them another ordeal—the judicial combat. An ordeal it is, Trial by Battle. for though the Church has looked askance at it, it is no appeal to mere brute force; it is an appeal to the God of Battles. Very solemnly does each combatant swear to the truth of his cause; very solemnly does he swear that he has eaten nothing, drunk nothing “whereby the law of God may be debased or the devil’s law exalted.” When a criminal charge is made—“an appeal of felony”—the accuser and the accused, if they be not maimed, nor too young, nor too old, will have to fight in person. When a claim for land is made, the plaintiff has to offer battle, not in his own person, but in the person of one of his men. This man is in theory a witness who will swear to the justice of his lord’s cause. In theory he ought not to be, but in practice he often is, a hired champion who makes a profession of fighting other people’s battles. If the hireling be exposed, he may have his hand struck off; but as a matter of fact there were champions in a large way of business. At least in some cases the arms that are used are very curious; they are made of wood and horn, and look (for we have pictures of them) like short pick-axes. Possibly they have been in use for this sacral purpose—a sacral purpose it is—ever since an age which knew not iron. Also we know that the champion’s head is shaved, but are left to guess why this is done. The battle may last the livelong day, until the stars appear. The accuser has undertaken that in the course of a day he will “prove by his body” the truth of his charge; and if he cannot do this before the twilight falls, he has failed and is a perjurer. The object of each party in the fight is not so much to kill his adversary—this perhaps he is hardly likely to do with the archaic weapon that he wields—but to make him pronounce “the loathsome word,” to make him cry “craven.” In a criminal case the accused, if vanquished, was forthwith hanged or mutilated; but in any case the craven had to pay a fine of sixty shillings, the old “king’s ban” of the Frankish laws, and, having in effect confessed himself a perjurer, he was thenceforward infamous.

But long ago the Frankish kings had placed themselves outside the sphere of this ancient formal and sacral procedure. They were standing in the shoes of Roman governors, even of Roman emperors. For themselves and their own affairs they had a prerogative procedure. If their rights were in question, they would direct their officers to call together the best and oldest men of the neighbourhood to swear about the relevant facts. The royal officers would make an inquisition, hold an inquest, force men to swear that they would return true answers to whatever questions might be addressed to them in the king's name. They may be asked whether or no this piece of land belongs to the king; they may be asked in a general way what lands the king has in their district; they may be asked (for the king is beginning to see that he has a great interest in the suppression of violent crime) to tell tales of their neighbours, to report the names of all who are suspected of murder or robbery, and then these men can be sent to the ordeal. This privilege that the king has he can concede to others; he can grant to his favourite churches that their lands shall stand outside the scope of the clumsy and hazardous procedure of the common courts; if their title to those lands be challenged, a royal officer will call upon the neighbours to declare the truth—in other words, to give a verdict. It is here that we see the germ of the jury.

The Norman duke in his conquered kingdom was able to use the inquest with a free hand and on a grand scale. Domesday Book was compiled out of the verdicts returned by the men of the various hundreds and townships of England in answer to a string of questions put to them by royal commissioners. We have read how the stern king thought it no shame to do what the English monk thought it shame to write, how he numbered every ox, every cow, every pig in England. Thenceforward the inquest was part of the machinery of government; it could be employed for many different purposes whenever the king desired information. He could use it in his own litigation, he could place it at the service of other litigants who were fortunate enough or rich enough to obtain this favour from him. But throughout the reigns of our Norman kings it keeps its prerogative character.



1216]

Then Henry II., bent upon making his justice supreme throughout his realm, put this royal remedy at the disposal of all his subjects. This he The King's Assizes. did not by one general law, but piecemeal, by a series of ordinances known as "assizes," some of which we may yet read, while others have perished. For example, when there was litigation about the ownership of land, the defendant, instead of accepting the plaintiff's challenge to fight, was allowed to "put himself upon the king's grand assize." Thereupon the action, which had been begun in some feudal court, was removed into the king's court; and twelve knights, chosen from the district in which the land lay, gave a verdict as to whether the plaintiff or the defendant had the better right. In other cases—for example, when the dispute was about the possession, not the ownership, of land—less solemn forms of the inquest were employed: twelve free and lawful men, not necessarily knights, were charged to say whether the defendant had ejected the plaintiff. Before the twelfth century was at an end, the inquest in one form or another—sometimes it was called an assize, sometimes a jury—had become part of the normal procedure in almost every kind of civil action. Still there long remained many cases in which a defendant could, if he chose, reject the new-fangled mode of trial, and claim the ancient right of purging himself with oath-helpers, or of picking up the glove that the plaintiff had thrown down as a gage of battle. Even a prelate of the Church would sometimes rely rather upon the strong arm of a professional pugilist than upon the testimony of his neighbours. Within the walls of the chartered boroughs men were conservative of all that would favour the free burgher at the cost of the despised outsider. The Londoners thought that trial by jury was good enough for those who were not citizens, but the citizen must be allowed to swear away charges of debt or trespass by the oaths of his friends. In the old communal courts, too, the county and hundred courts, where the landowners of the district sat as doomsmen, trial by jury never struck root, for only by virtue of a royal writ could a jury be summoned: this is one of the reasons why those old courts languished, decayed, and became useless. However, before the Middle Ages were over, trial by jury had become the only form of trial for civil actions that had any

vitality. So late as 1824 a lucky litigant, taking advantage of his adversary's slip, presented himself at the bar of the King's Bench, prepared to swear away a debt—"to make his law" was the technical phrase—with the aid of eleven oath-helpers, and not until 1833 was this world-old procedure abolished by statute; but long before this, if the plaintiff was well-advised, he could always prevent his opponent from escaping in this easy fashion.

We have spoken of "trial by jury." That term naturally calls up before our minds a set of twelve men called into court in order that they may listen to the testimony of witnesses, give a

**The Earliest  
Jury-Trial.**

true verdict "according to the evidence," and, in short, act as judges of those questions of fact that are in dispute. But it is very long after Henry II.'s day before trial by jury takes this form. Originally the jurors are called in, not in order that they may hear, but in order that they may give, evidence. They are witnesses. They are the neighbours of the parties; they are presumed to know before they come into court the facts about which they are to testify. They are chosen by the sheriff to represent the neighbourhood—indeed, they are spoken of as being "the neighbourhood," "the country"—and the neighbourhood, the country will know the facts. In the twelfth century population was sparse, and men really knew far more of the doings of their neighbours than we know nowadays. It was expected that all legal transactions would take place in public; the conveyance of land was made in open court, the wife was endowed at the church-door, the man who bought cattle in secret ran a great but just risk of being treated as a thief; every three weeks a court was held in the village, and all the affairs of every villager were discussed. The verdict, then, was the sworn testimony of the countryside; and if the twelve jurors perjured themselves, the verdict of another jury of twenty-four might send them to prison and render them infamous for ever. In course of time, and by slow degrees—degrees so slow that we can hardly detect them—the jury put off its old and acquired a new character. Sometimes, when the jurors knew nothing of the facts, witnesses who did know the facts would be called in to supply the requisite information. As human affairs grew more complex, the

neighbours whom the sheriff summoned became less and less able to perform their original duty, more and more dependent upon the evidence given in their presence by those witnesses who were summoned by the parties. In the fifteenth century the change had taken place, though in yet later days a man who had been summoned as a juror, and who sought to escape on the ground that he already knew something of the facts in question, would be told that he had given a very good reason for his being placed in the jury-box. We may well say, therefore, that trial by jury, though it has its roots in the Frankish inquest, grew up on English soil; and until recent times it was distinctive of England and Scotland, for on the Continent of Europe all other forms of legal procedure had been gradually supplanted by that which canonists and civilians had constructed out of ancient Roman elements.

We have yet to speak of the employment of the inquest in criminal cases. The Frankish kings had employed it for the purpose of detecting **Criminal Procedure.** crime. Do you suspect any of murder, robbery, larceny, or the like? This question was addressed by royal officers to selected representatives of every neighbourhood, and answered upon oath, and the suspected persons were sent to "the judgment of God." The Church borrowed this procedure; the bishop could detect ecclesiastical offences as the king detected crimes. It is not impossible that this particular form of the inquest had made its way into England some half-century before the Norman Conquest; but we hear very little about it until the days of Henry II. He ordained that it should be used upon a very large scale and as a matter of ordinary practice, both by the justices whom he sent to visit the counties and by the sheriffs. From his time onward a statement made upon oath by a set of jurors representing a hundred, to the effect that such an one is suspected of such a crime, is sufficient to put a man upon his trial. It is known as an indictment. It takes its place beside the old accusation, or "appeal," urged by the person who has been wronged, by the man whose goods have been stolen or the nearest kinsman of the murdered man. It is but an accusation, however, and in Henry's days the indicted person takes his chance at the hot iron or the cold water; God may be for him, though man

be against him. But already some suspicion is shown of the so-called judgment of God; for though he comes clean from the ordeal, he has to leave the country, swearing never to return. At last, in 1215, the Fourth Lateran Council forbade the clergy to take part in this superstitious rite. After this we hear no more in England of the ordeal as a legal process, though in much later days the popular belief that witches will swim died hard, and many an old woman was put in the pond. The judges of the thirteenth century had no substitute ready to take the place of that supernatural test of which an enlightened Pope had deprived them. Of course if the indicted person will agree to accept the verdict of his neighbours, will "put himself upon his country"—that is, upon the neighbourhood—for good and ill, all is easy. Those who have indicted him as a suspicious character can now be asked whether he is guilty or no; and if they say that he is guilty, there will be no harm in hanging him, for he consented to the trial, and he must abide the consequences. To make the trial yet fairer, one may call in a second jury different from that which indicted him. Here is the origin of those two juries which we see employed in our own days—the grand jury that indicts, and the petty jury that tries. But suppose that he will not give his consent; it is by no means obvious that the testimony of his neighbours ought to be treated as conclusive. Hitherto he has been able to invoke the judgment of God, and can we now deprive him of this ancient, this natural right? No, no one can be tried by jury who does not consent to be so tried. But what we can do is this—we can

**Peine Forte et Dure.** compel him to give his consent, we can starve him into giving his consent, and, again, we can quicken the slow action of starvation by laying him out naked on the floor of the dungeon and heaping weights upon his chest until he says that he will abide by the verdict of his fellows. And so we are brought to the pedantic cruelty of the "peine forte et dure." Even in the seventeenth century there were men who would endure the agony of being pressed to death rather than utter the few words which would have subjected them to a trial by jury. They had a reason for their fortitude. Had they been hanged as felons their property would have been confiscated, their children would have been penniless; while, as it was, they left the world obstinate indeed, but unconvicted.

All this—and until 1772 men might still be pressed to death—takes us back to a time when the ordeal seems the fair and natural mode of ascertaining guilt and innocence, when the jury is still a new-fangled institution.

The indictment, we have said, took its place beside the “appeal”—the old private accusation. The owner of the stolen goods, the kinsman of the murdered man, might still prosecute his suit in the old manner, and offer to prove his assertions by his body. The Church had not abolished, and could not abolish, the judicial combat, for though in truth it was an ordeal, no priestly benediction of the instruments that were to be used was necessary. By slow degrees in the thirteenth century the accused acquired the right of refusing his accuser’s challenge and of putting himself upon a jury. What is more, the judges began to favour the “indictment” and to discourage the “appeal” by all possible means. They required of the accuser a punctilious observance of ancient formalities, and would quash his accusation if he were guilty of the smallest blunder. Still, throughout the Middle Ages we occasionally hear of battles being fought over criminal cases. In particular a convicted felon would sometimes turn “approver”—that is to say, he would obtain a pardon conditional on his ridding the world, by means of his appeals, of some three or four other felons. If he failed in his endeavour, he was forthwith hanged. But those who were not antiquarians must have long ago ceased to believe that such a barbarism as trial by battle was possible, when

in 1818 a case arose which showed them that they had inadequately gauged the dense conservatism of the laws of their country. One Mary Ashford was found drowned; one Abraham Thornton was indicted for murdering her; a jury acquitted him. But the verdict did not satisfy the public mind, and the brother of the dead girl had recourse to an “appeal”: to this accusation the previous acquittal was no answer. Thornton declared himself ready to defend his innocence by his body, and threw down in Westminster Hall, as his gage of battle, an antique gauntlet, “without either fingers or thumb, made of white tanned skin, ornamented with sewn tracery and silk fringes, crossed by a narrow band of red leather, with leathern tags and thongs for fastening.” The judges did their best to discover some slip

Abraham  
Thornton's Case,  
1818.

in his procedure; but he had been careful and well advised; even his glove was of the true mediæval pattern. So there was nothing for it but to declare that he was within his rights, and could not be compelled to submit to a jury if he preferred to fight. His adversary had no mind to fight, and so let the glove alone. After this crowning scandal Parliament at last bestirred itself, and in the year of grace 1819 completed the work of Pope Innocent III. by abolishing the last of the ordeals.

If we regard it as an engine for the discovery of truth and for the punishment of malefactors, the mediæval jury was a clumsy thing. Too often its verdicts must have represented guess-work and the tittle-tattle of the countryside. Sometimes a man must have gone to the gallows, not because anyone had seen him commit a crime, not because guilt had been brought home to him by a carefully-tested chain of proved facts, but because it was notorious that he was just the man from whom a murder or a robbery might be expected. Only by slow degrees did the judges insist that the jurors ought to listen to evidence given by witnesses in open court, and rely only upon the evidence that was there given. Even when this step had been taken, it was long before our modern law of evidence took shape, long before the judges laid down such rules as that "hearsay is not evidence," and that testimony which might show that the prisoner had committed other crimes was not relevant to the question whether he had perpetrated the particular offence of which he stood indicted.

But whatever may have been the case in the days of the ordeal—and about this we know very little—we may be fairly certain that in the later Middle Ages the escape of the guilty was far commoner than the punishment of the guiltless. After some hesitation our law had adopted its well-known rule that a jury can give no verdict unless the twelve men are all of one mind. To obtain a condemnatory unanimity was not easy if the accused was a man of good family; one out of every twelve of his neighbours that might be taken at random would stand out loyally for his innocence. Bribery could do much; seignorial influence could do more; the sheriff, who was not incorruptible, and had his own likes and dislikes, could do all, since it was for him to find the jury. It is easy for us to

denounce as unconstitutional the practice which prevailed under Tudors and Stuarts of making jurors answer for their verdicts before the King's Council; it is not so easy for us to make certain that the jury system would have lived through the sixteenth century had it not been for the action of this somewhat irregular check. For the rest, we may notice that the jury of the Middle Ages, if it is to be called a democratic institution, can be called so only in a mediæval sense. The jurors were freeholders; the great mass of Englishmen were not freeholders. The peasant who was charged with a crime was acquitted or convicted by the word of his neighbours, but by the word of neighbours who considered themselves very much his superiors.

If, however, we look back to these old days, we shall find ourselves deploring, not so much that some men of whose guilt we are by no means satisfied are sent to the gallows, as that many men whose guilt is but too obvious escape scot-free. We take up a roll upon which the presentments of the jurors are recorded. Everywhere the same tale meets our eye. "Malefactors came by night to the house of such an one at such a place; they slew him and his wife and his sons and his daughters, and robbed his house; we do not know who they were; we suspect no one." Such organisation as there was for the pursuit of these marauders was utterly inefficient. Every good and lawful man is bound to follow the hue and cry when it is raised, and the village reeve, or in later days the village constable, ought to put himself at the head of this improvised and unprofessional police force. But it was improvised and unprofessional. Outside the walls of the boroughs there was no regular plan of watch and ward, no one whose business it was to keep an eye on men of suspicious habits, or to weave the stray threads of evidence into a halter. The neighbours who had followed the trail of the stolen cattle to the county boundary were apt to turn back, every man to his plough. "Let Gloucestershire folk mind Gloucestershire rogues." They would be fined and amerced, when the justices came round, for neglect of their duties—for the sheriff, or the coroner, or someone else, would tell tales of them—but meanwhile their hay was about, and the weather was rainy. Even when the jurors know the criminal's name, the chances seem to be quite ten to one that he has not



been captured. Nothing could then be done but outlaw him. At four successive county courts—the county court was held month by month—a proclamation calling upon him to present himself, “to come in to the king’s peace,” would be made, and at the fifth court he would be declared an outlaw. If after this he were caught, then, unless he could obtain some favour from the king, he would be condemned to death without any investigation being made of his guilt or innocence; the mere fact of his outlawry being proved, sentence followed as a matter of course. But the old law had been severer than this: to slay the outlaw wherever he might be found was not only the right but the duty of every true man, and even in the middle of the thirteenth century this was still the customary law of the Welsh marches. The outlaw of real life was not the picturesque figure that we have seen upon the stage; if he and his men were really “merry” in the green-wood, they were merry in creditable circumstances. Still, it is not to be denied that he attracted at times a good deal of romantic sympathy, even in the ages which really knew him. This probably had its origin in the brutal stringency of the forest laws, which must be charged with the stupid blunder of punishing small offences with a rigour which should have been reserved for the worst crimes.

The worst crimes were common enough. Every now and then the king and the nation would be alarmed, nor needlessly alarmed, by the prevalence of murder and highway robbery. A new ordinance would be issued, new instructions would be given to the judges, sheriffs would be active, and jurors would be eager to convict; a good deal of hanging would be done, perhaps too indiscriminately. But so soon as the panic was over, Justice would settle down into her old sluggish habits. Throughout the Middle Ages life was very insecure; there was a great deal of nocturnal marauding, and the knife that every Englishman wore was apt to stab upon slight provocation.

The Church had not mended matters by sanctifying places and persons. In very old days when the blood-feud raged, when punishment and vengeance were very much one, it was a good thing that there should be holy places to which a man might flee when the avenger of blood was behind—places where no

**The Right of  
Sanctuary.**

1218]

drop of blood might be spilt without sacrilege. They afforded an opportunity for the peacemaker. The bishop or priest would not yield up the fugitive who lay panting at the foot of the altar until terms had been made between him and his pursuers. But at a later time when the State was endeavouring to punish criminals, and there would be no punishment until after trial, the sanctuary was a public nuisance. The law was this:—If a criminal entered a church he was safe from pursuit; the neighbours who were pursuing him were bound to beset the church, prevent his escape, and send for the coroner. Sometimes they would remain encamped round the church for many days. At last the coroner would come, and parley with the fugitive. If he confessed his crime, then he might “abjure the realm”—that is, swear to leave England within a certain number of days (he was allowed days enough to enable him to reach the nearest seaport), and never to return. If he strayed from the straight road which led to the haven, or if he came back to the realm, then he could at once be sentenced to death. For a man to take sanctuary, confess his crime and abjure the realm, was an everyday event, and we must have thus shipped off many a malefactor to plunder our neighbours in France and Flanders. If the man who had taken sanctuary would neither confess to a crime, nor submit to a trial, the State could do no more against him. It tried to teach the clergy that their duty was to starve him into submission; but the clergy resented this interference with holy things. A bad element of caprice was introduced into the administration of justice. The strong, the swift, the premeditating murderer cheated the gallows. Especially in the towns he might fairly complain of bad luck if he could not slip into one of the numerous churches before he was caught. On the other hand, the man who had not plotted his crime would get hanged.

And then the clergy stood outside the criminal law. If a clerk in holy orders committed a crime—this was the law of the thirteenth century—*“Benefit of Clergy.”* he could not be tried for it in a lay court. He could be accused there, and the judges might ask a jury whether he was guilty or no; but even though they found him guilty, this was no trial. At the request of his bishop—and the bishops made such requests as a matter of course—he was handed over.

for trial in an ecclesiastical court. Such a court had power to inflict very heavy punishments. It might draw no drop of blood, but it could imprison for life, besides being able to degrade the clerk from his orders. As a matter of fact, however, we hear very little of any punishment save that of degradation. What is more, the criminal procedure of the ecclesiastical courts in England was of an absurdly old-fashioned and clumsy kind. They held by compurgation. If the accused clerk could but get some eleven or twelve friends of his own profession to swear that they believed him innocent, he was acquitted; he might resume his criminal career. Church and State were both to blame for this sad story. The Church would yield no jot of the claims that were sanctified by the blood of St. Thomas; the lay courts would not suffer the bishops to do criminal justice in a really serious fashion. There can be no doubt that many of the worst criminals—men who had been found guilty by a jury of brutal murders and rapes—escaped scot-free, because they had about them some slight savour of professional holiness. It should be understood that this immunity was shared with the bishops, priests, and deacons by a vast multitude of men who were in “minor orders.” They might have no ecclesiastical duties to perform; they might be married; they might be living the same life which laymen lived; but they stood outside the ordinary criminal law. One of the worst evils of the later Middle Ages was this “benefit of clergy.” The king’s justices, who never loved it, at length reduced it to an illogical absurdity. They would not be at pains to require any real proof of a prisoner’s sacred character. If he could read a line in a book, this would do; indeed, it is even said that the same verse of the Psalms was set before the eyes of every prisoner, so that even the illiterate might escape if he could repeat by heart those saving words. Criminal law had been rough and rude, and sometimes cruel; it had used the gallows too readily; it had punished with death thefts which, owing to a great fall in the value of money, were becoming petty thefts. Still, cruelty in such matters is better than caprice, and the “benefit of clergy” had made the law capricious without making it less cruel.

1216]

It was at Hastings that the last trial of the old military system of the English was made. There the house-carles of King Harold, backed by the thegnhood of all Southern England and the disorderly masses of the fyrd of the home counties, drew themselves out on the hillside of Senlac to face an enemy of a different sort from any that had yet been seen north of the Channel. When Dane had fought Englishman, the battle had always been between serried bodies of foot soldiery, meeting fairly face to face in the wedge or column, with its shield-wall of warriors standing elbow to elbow, and hewing at each other over the "wall of war-lindens" till one side or other had the mastery.

C. OMAN.  
Norman Methods  
of Warfare.

But the Normans of Duke William had learnt from their Frankish neighbours the new method of fighting, which in the tenth century had superseded on the Continent the array of the old tribal hosts. While the Anglo-Danes of Harold stood on foot, shoulder to shoulder, like their ancestors who had fought under Alfred and Guthrum, the Normans and mercenary French of William came out in a triple line, armed in three divers manners. First stood the archery, then the heavy-armed foot, who still represented the ancient method of armament, then the great bodies of mailed horsemen, to whom the English had nothing to oppose. A few years before, Earl Ralph of Hereford had tried to teach the English thegnhood the art of fighting on horseback; but they did not take kindly to it. When he led them against the Welsh, disaster had followed, and the disaster had been universally ascribed to the fact that "Anglos contra morem in equos pugnare jussit." If only the experiment had been successful, Hastings might have seen a very different end to its battle.

William the Bastard knew only too well how to deal with the antiquated array of the English army. His archers, if unsupported by cavalry, might have been driven off the field by a single charge; his cavalry, if unsupported by archers, might have surged for ever around the impenetrable shield-wall of the English. But by combining the two armies, with perfect skill, he won his crowning victory. The English could not stand for ever unmoved under the deadly hail of the Norman arrows. After long endurance, the

Cavalry.

undisciplined masses of the fyrd burst down from the heights to sweep away the archery that galled them so. Then, when the compact shield-wall was broken, William thrust his horsemen into the gaps, and the steadfast house-carles of Harold, though they stood their ground to the last man, were slowly hewn down.

“ So Harold Godwinson was laid  
Across his broken banner cold  
Upon the blood-soaked Sussex mould,  
And o’er the wrack of Senlac field  
Full-fed the grey-nebbed raven wheeled.”

The Norman Conquest produced a complete change in the military organisation of England—the system of raising the armed force, the tactics that it employed, and the weapons that it used, being all alike new. For the next two hundred and fifty years the mailed feudal horseman was to be the main power in war. The Anglo-Norman kings continued to call out the fyrd on occasion, but never trusted to it as their chief strength; infantry had become of secondary importance in the field. It was the mounted followers of the Norman knights—the earls, among whom William had distributed the lands of the English on the tenure of military service, that were the really important element in his army. Clad in the long mail shirt and peaked helmet with nasal, bearing the kite-shaped Danish shield, and using the lance as their chief weapon, the Norman horse were the flower of the chivalry of Europe, as they showed not only on English soil, but in far-off fights like Civitella, Durazzo, or Antioch.

Besides introducing the supremacy of cavalry, the Normans developed to a hitherto unexampled importance the building of castles and fortresses. Saxon and Dane had been contented to surround themselves with a moat and palisade, except when (as at London or Chester) they could patch up and utilise an old Roman town-wall. The Normans commenced a new era in military building, just as they did in ecclesiastical building. Conquered England was held down by dozens of castles, square keeps with walls of enormous thickness built of solid stone, and often relying solely on their own strength without being surrounded by any outworks. The English, in their revolts, could never storm one of the new castles, and the Norman kings themselves

1216]

had always the greatest difficulty in reducing the stronghold of a revolted vassal. In the eleventh century the art of defence had quite outgrown the art of attack ; siege engines were few and primitive ; to undermine a corner of the castle, or strive to set it on fire, was the most that a besieger could do. Starvation was the only sure and certain way of reducing it, and unless the castellan had been caught unawares and unprovisioned, the process of starvation took many months.

The two centuries during which feudal cavalry was supreme in England were more notable for their sieges than for their great battles in the open field. To take the defensive behind strong walls was so far more profitable a policy for the weaker party than to try the fortune of war in the pitched battle, that campaigns were generally nothing more than a series of successful or unsuccessful sieges. William Rufus' war with his revolted vassals, Henry I.'s struggle with Robert de Belesme, the long duel between Stephen and Queen Maud, produced sieges by the dozen ; but only two really important battles that of the Standard, in 1138, and Lincoln, in 1141. Tenchebrai and Bremûle, the two Continental fights of Henry I., were mere cavalry skirmishes. The details of the fight of Lincoln show the all-importance of cavalry. The king had his infantry massed in the centre, and his horse on the flanks ; the Earls of Chester and Gloucester, his adversaries, had three bodies of horse as their main line, flanked by some Welsh light infantry on the wings. The battle was settled by the king's horse being driven off the field by that of the barons, when the mass of infantry in the centre, where Stephen himself stood, was surrounded and gradually broken up by charges of the victorious cavalry of the two earls.

The Battle of the Standard (1138) differed from the other engagements of the time in being mainly fought between infantry. The army of David of Scotland was composed of wild tribal levies of Highland and Galwegian footmen, with only two hundred mailed knights who served about the king's person. The English army which opposed him was the fyrd of Yorkshire, with a comparatively small body of feudal horse to back it. Hence the fighting consisted of a series of dashes made by the undisciplined Scots against the level front of spears and axes which the Yorkshiremen opposed to them. Archery mainly settled the day ; for the English—for the first time

on record—had brought many bowmen into the field, to whom the Scots had nothing to oppose. The only cavalry charge of the day occurred when Prince Henry of Scotland covered the retreat of the wreck of his father's army, by a desperate and unsuccessful onslaught at the head of his little squadron of two hundred knights, "of whom only eight took their harness safely back to Scotland."

From the days of Stephen to those of Edward I. there is not much to record in the way of change in the tactics of English armies. The cavalry still remained the great power, while infantry was only treated as an auxiliary. Richard I., the greatest soldier of his day, only leaves his mark on our military annals in virtue of his introduction of the cross-bow, and his systematic castle-building. That the cross-bow passed as a decisive and important weapon shows how little the archery of England had yet developed; the long-bow was still in its infancy, and in the assize of arms of Henry II. (A.D. 1181), no class of subjects of the realm is required to come to war with bow and arrows; the yeomen, who in after generations formed the invincible archery of England, were bidden to equip themselves with hawberk and spear. The cross-bow was mainly in the hands of foreign mercenaries: Richard and John both kept bands of Continental cross-bowmen in pay, and the second battle of Lincoln (A.D. 1216) was mainly won by the strong shooting of the mercenary arbalisters of Fawkes de Bréauté, John's French captain of adventurers.

The second half of the twelfth century has one point of interest which must be noted—the supplementing of the feudal levies by the hiring of professional soldiers of fortune. Kings who, like Henry II. and Richard I., waged long wars far from home, felt the gravest inconvenience from the character of the armies which they led. A feudal host could only be kept in the field for a short time; it was untrained, undisciplined, and disorderly. Long service away from home it would not brook. So the kings were driven to the expedient of employing large bodies of mercenaries, who would keep the field for any space of time, and would serve as long as they were paid. Henry II. proposed to the English baronage and knighthood the institution of *scutage*, by which

**The Professional  
Soldier.**



1216]

every one was allowed to compound for personal service with the king, by paying a fixed sum for every shield that he was feudally bound to bring to the host. The device was accepted with content, and for distant expeditions the king in future raised large bodies of mercenaries, paid with the funds which the scutage brought him in. For expeditions nearer home, against Welsh, or Scots, or native rebels, both the feudal levy and the national fyrd were still employed. It was, for example, mainly the native levy-en-masse which routed the Earl of Leicester's mercenaries at Fornham in 1174, and took Bedford from the rebellious Fawkes de Bréauté in 1224.

While the art of war still remained almost stationary as to war in the open field, the improvements in the art of fortification never ceased to progress.

The Art of  
Defence.

The old Norman castle, with its square and massive keep, was, in the twelfth century, surrounded by outer defences, which grew more and more complicated. First outer walls were added to the tower, then these outer walls were strengthened with gate-towers, and other towers were inserted in the *enceinte* to provide a cross-fire from the flank against any attacks made on the long stretches of "curtain." Machicolation and projecting brattices (galleries standing out from the face of the wall) were added to enable the garrison to command the ditch and the foot of the walls better than could be done from the rampart itself. At last a well-built castle, like Richard I.'s great masterpiece the Château Gaillard, became a complicated mass of fortification, with several lines of defence, which could be held one after another in succession even when the besiegers had forced the outer wall. Meanwhile in the art of attack, though siege engines—mangonels, catapults, and perriers of all sorts—were increased in number and efficiency, they were still quite unable to cope with the new obstacles which the improved fortification threw in their way. Sieges lasted for month after month, and starvation was still the only absolutely certain method of attack. A persevering general would build a line of circumvallation round the enemy's walls, and leave hunger to do its work. The only way of hastening a protracted but hopeless defence was to threaten to hang the garrison if they resisted after all chance of

succour was gone—a threat occasionally carried into execution—as, for example, by Hubert de Burgh at Bedford, in 1224.

VERY little is known concerning the fleet which carried William and his army to England. The contemporary chroniclers were not men possessed of special naval knowledge, and the accounts given by them differ considerably one from another. One historian gives the number of vessels as four hundred ships each with a large mast and sail, and more than a thousand transport boats; another tells us that there were three thousand craft carrying sails; a third speaks of nine hundred and seven great ships; and William of Poitiers says that, although Agamemnon conquered Troy with a thousand vessels, William needed more to conquer England. Nor can we be certain as to the sizes and types of ships engaged. The chief source of information upon these points is the Bayeux Tapestry. It is disputed whether we are to attribute this interesting piece of needlework to Queen Matilda, the wife, or to the Empress Matilda, the grand-daughter of the Conqueror; but there is no doubt whatever that it was produced by some of the ladies connected with the Norman Court. In no age have women of gentle birth had more than a very imperfect acquaintance with ships and ship-life. They cannot, moreover, be expected to appreciate the importance of a block, the significance of a rope or stay, or the force of the laws which govern a ship's stability and seaworthiness. It cannot, therefore be supposed that the workers of the Bayeux Tapestry have left us an exact and trustworthy representation of the details of such vessels as they may have seen and voyaged in. Indeed, there is specific as well as presumptive evidence that the needlework disdains accuracy, and aims only at general effects. In the Tapestry, for example, William's own ship is shown, with its stern decorated with the effigy of a boy blowing a horn and holding in his left hand a gonfalon, and with its bow bearing a lion's head as a figurehead, but a contemporary MS. in the Bodleian Library says that on the bow of William's ship, the *Mora*, Matilda, who had ordered the vessel to be

built, caused to be placed a golden boy, with his right index finger pointing to England, and with his left hand pressing an ivory horn to his lips; and Wace corroborates this account of the position of the boy.

None of the ships of the period were large; and it seems probable that few, if any, of them were of more than about thirty tons burthen. They were clincher-built, or, in other words, their planks were laid on so that each one overlapped the upper edge of the one immediately below it, and they were constructed on the beach and launched bows foremost. Both bow and stern were raised, and, in the case of the larger vessels, both bore some kind of ornament. There was never more than one mast, which was stepped amidships, and which could be struck by being lowered down forward. It carried a single yard, and a lug-sail which was often parti-coloured, and which was sometimes covered with a decorative design. At the mast-head there was neither truck nor vane, except in the chief vessel of a squadron or fleet. The Tapestry represents the *Mora* to have carried, at the mast-head, a sort of square white banner charged with a gold upright cross within a blue border, the whole surmounted by a gold cross. Wace describes the mast-head as having borne a lantern and a gilt brass vane. The steersman sat in the stern, holding in his left hand the sheet, and in his right the steering paddle, or *clavus*. It is not likely that the largest ships carried more than forty or fifty men. The freeboard of all the vessels was low, and it was no doubt with the object of heightening it, and so keeping out a certain amount of spray, that the soldiers who were on board disposed their shields around the gunwale. There is no evidence that any of William's ships were decked, and it may be safely assumed that in bad weather they were exceedingly unsafe and terribly uncomfortable. Before the expedition started, and while it was lying off Saint-Valery-en-Caux, several of the vessels foundered at their anchors; and, seeing how long the fleet was delayed, it is only surprising that there were not many more losses of this kind. The vessels, it is interesting to note, appear to have been always carefully painted, generally with horizontal stripes of different colours. They were not, it must be supposed, very costly to build, for William, after landing at Pevensey,

destroyed the whole of his flotilla; and this, had it been difficult to replace them, he would scarcely have done merely in order to impress his followers with the fact that there was for them no retreat.

The only fittings of the Norman vessels consisted, apparently, of the mast and its stays, the sail, the oars, the *clavus*, a cable, and an anchor which was carried inboard, and dropped, as now, over the bows. Some of William's ships carried horses—to the number of from three to eight—as well as men; but there are no signs that any special provision was made for the comfort of the animals; and the Tapestry represents them as being landed by the simple expedient of being driven overboard and allowed to walk or swim ashore. How the yard was connected with the mast we do not know, nor is it possible to say whether or not blocks were used. The Normans were, however, acquainted with blocks, for they employed them in launching, if not in rigging and working, their vessels.

The crews that manned the war-fleets of those days were made up of several elements. There were a few professional seamen, there were large numbers of soldiers, and there were a great many adventurers, scoundrels, and cut-throats. The discipline both in England and in Normandy was lax. Harold, immediately before the invasion, found himself unable, owing to the withdrawal of his men, to keep his ships in commission, and his commanders were, in consequence, deprived of the power of meeting William at sea. William, for his part, experienced great difficulty, first in collecting, and then in keeping together, his forces. He bribed his great nobles and the clergy to assist him, promising them money, land, or slaves. As an inducement to Remi, priest of Fécamp, he held out an English bishopric in exchange for a ship and a score of men-at-arms; and, when his followers became depressed and apprehensive, William revived their spirits not only by reminding them of the high favour with which the Church regarded the undertaking, but also by keeping them well supplied with strong drink. The professional seamen were probably not numerous enough to leaven the whole mass of the fleet. It had never been the policy of the Normans to foster a commercial navy; and where there is no commercial navy there cannot be many

seamen. But even among the Normans there seems to have been already a small class of men who followed the sea as a calling, and who made their descendants seamen also. Stephen FitzErard, captain of the *Mora*, apparently belonged to this class; and it was Thomas, his son, or grandson, who, in 1120, was captain of the *Blanche* or *White Ship* upon the unhappy occasion when William, son of Henry I., and many of his noble relatives and friends, were drowned among the rocks in the Race of Catteville.

In England, on the other hand, trade had been encouraged and had flourished amazingly. It was regarded as an honour, and not, as in Nor- **Harold's Navy.** mandy, as a disgrace, to be a merchant; and the successful merchant who had made three voyages in his own vessel became thereby entitled to the rank of thane. The River Thames was always full of shipping, English and foreign; and the tolls must have amounted to large sums. There can be no question that the merchant navy, under Edward the Confessor and Harold, was very considerable; neither is there any doubt that there was also a regular war-navy. There had, indeed, been one ever since the days of Ethelred. It had, moreover, been called out for exercise every year immediately after Easter. We do not know exactly how it was raised and paid; but it is certain that at least part of it was furnished and manned by the leading maritime ports. Dover and Sandwich, if not all the places which later became known as the Cinque Ports, and many other havens, were, long before the Conquest, severally obliged to furnish the king with twenty ships for fifteen days, once in every year, each vessel having a crew of twenty-one persons. And some of the inland towns contributed in men, in money, or in kind. There were also from time to time, special levies for ships and there was the permanent tax called "Danegeld," which, although some believe it to have been imposed in order to provide money for buying off Danish marauders, was more probably instituted as a national naval defence fund. There were thus, in England, a school of seamen of old standing and a respectable navy, when William started upon his expedition and everything points to the conclusion that if Harold's men had not been allowed too literally to interpret the law which permitted them, after their annual service, to go to their homes

on the Feast of the Nativity of St. Mary, William, who sailed three weeks later, might have been easily defeated at sea. The men would probably have been willing to remain had the danger of the kingdom been properly represented to them; for many of them seem to have spontaneously rejoined immediately after William had landed. They rejoined too late, however, to be of any practical use. Godwin and Edmund, the sons of Harold, put themselves at the head of the fleet and carried it to Ireland, whence for several years they conducted a series of semi-piratical depredations on the coast of the West of England; but these operations were no more effective than were the very similar operations of Prince Rupert against the Commonwealth nearly six hundred years afterwards; and the ships of the princes were, one by one, fruitlessly expended. Thus England was, for a time, left without a war-navy; and so absolutely unable was she, three or four years after William had destroyed his fleet, to make her power felt upon the sea, that, in 1070, the Conqueror found himself obliged to buy off the Danes, who for four months had lain unmolested in the Humber, and had used their ships as a centre whence to ravage and plunder from York to Ely. But William re-created an English fleet ere he had been long upon the throne. As early as 1071 he was able to operate by sea against the rebellious Earl Morkere; and in 1072 he despatched a force of ships against Scotland. These ships were obtained in part from the coast towns under the stipulations of their tenures; in part from the Danegeld; and in part from private owners who exchanged their ships for grants of land.

It would be idle to deny that the maritime population of England was at this period wild and lawless in the extreme; and that the coasts, even in times of nominal peace, were generally unsafe for honest people. The king was supposed to protect the narrow seas from the depredations of pirates and robbers, and, in part return, he received certain dues and tolls, and all the fish known as "great," or "royal" that were caught or stranded within his dominions. "Of sturgeon caught on our lands," runs the ordinance as quoted by Nicolas from Bracton, "we will that it shall be ours, saving to the finder his costs and expenses. And of whales so found we will that

**Maritime Affairs.**  
1067-1100.

1216]

the head shall be ours, and the tail our consort's, agreeable to ancient usage." Whether the early Norman sovereigns also arrogated to themselves the dominion of the seas is doubtful. It was the object of Selden, Prynne, and the learned jurists of their day to make it appear that our kings had done so almost from time immemorial; but it is more than suspected that some of these lawyers strained, if they did not invent, facts to substantiate their conclusions; and there is little ground for belief that the dominion of the seas was ever formally claimed for this country before the days of John. It is certain, in any case, that the seas and coasts were very badly policed, and that, if pretensions to maritime sovereignty were cherished, the kings did little or nothing towards the practical assertion of them. The narrow seas swarmed with freebooters of several nationalities; and the shores, unlighted and unbuoyed, were rendered the more dangerous by the fact that those who lived upon them were pirates and wreckers. Only in a few of the larger ports were the laws observed. Elsewhere might was right.

An expedition which, in 1189, was fitted out by the Earls of Chester and Shrewsbury against Anglesey provides illustration of the state of affairs in the reign of William II. The Welsh princes were nominally vassals of the English crown, but this fact did not prevent the two earls from treating Anglesey much as, at a later period, the buccaneers treated some parts of the Spanish Main. They landed, plundered and massacred the inhabitants, and had collected, ready for shipment, an enormous booty, when Magnus, a Norwegian pirate, descended upon them from the sea, defeated them, killed the Earl of Shrewsbury, and carried off all the spoils.

The lack of system and subordination that had rendered the fleet of Harold useless against the invasion of William the Conqueror, did not disappear in the immediately succeeding reigns; and to ill-discipline and insubordination there was added, in the reign of Henry I., disloyalty. In 1101, when Robert, Duke of Normandy, was threatening invasion, Henry had little difficulty in collecting a large squadron; but he could not retain it. No sooner had it sailed than great part of it deserted to the enemy; and, had not a timely peace been arranged between the royal brothers, Henry would have

Henry I.'s Navy.  
1100-1134.



probably lost his crown, for, in the history of England, the dominion of the soil has usually lain with him who has enjoyed command of the sea. The disloyalty of the seamen and coast population wore away, however, as the reign grew older, and as Henry won opportunity for making his true nature known to them. His modification of the law of wreck was no doubt a measure that gained him great popularity as well with the maritime as with the great commercial classes. Up to his day, upon the loss of a vessel, any cargo that was cast ashore belonged to the king; but Henry ordained that if any person escaped alive from a lost vessel, the ship should not be treated as a wreck, and property in her and her contents should not be held to have passed away from the original owner.

It was in this reign that the peculiar genius of the English for maritime adventure first began to show itself. In 1102 Edgar, grandson of Edmund Ironside, undertook a crusading expedition to the Holy Land, and, five years later, one "Hardinge of England," appeared with the Christian fleet at Joppa during the siege of Jerusalem. This genius for adventure seems to have been aroused by the Continental Normans, who were already acquiring great influence in the Mediterranean, and who soon found formidable rivals in their island kinsmen. It is an old maxim that trade follows the flag; and although, owing to the long continuance of the wars of the Crusades, the earliest adventures of the English in the Levant did not lead to the immediate opening of commercial relations with the East, they certainly paved the way for it, and enabled such relations to be entered into as soon as the establishment of peace permitted. English participation in distant adventure had another result equally important and more speedy. It brought about considerable improvements in naval architecture, a science which for several centuries had made very little progress. Men were not slow in discovering that the vessels which would serve well enough for a fine weather passage across the Channel were scarcely fit to brave the huge rollers of the Bay of Biscay, and to face the varying conditions of a long voyage. Whether many improvements had been made by the year 1120 is uncertain; but it is recorded that the *Blanche*—the ship or "nef" commonly called the *White Ship*, which was lost in that year with William

“the Ætheling” and his suite—had fifty oars, and that when she went to pieces there were lost with her about three hundred souls. Even if we admit that the number of passengers may have been exaggerated, we cannot easily avoid the conclusion that the *Blanche* was a much larger craft than any which belonged to William the Conqueror’s fleet of 1066. William, we are moreover told, left the sinking ship in a boat, and might have saved himself had he refrained from attempting to rescue his half-sister, Mary; and we find no evidence that any of the Conqueror’s ships had boats belonging to or accompanying them.

Another noteworthy circumstance connected with this period is the rise of Portsmouth as a place of naval importance. Robert, Duke of Normandy, when intending to invade England, landed at Portsmouth in 1101. Henry I. more than once made Portsmouth his point of departure for Normandy, and in 1141, when the Empress Maud came to England to assert her son’s right to the crown, she disembarked at Portsmouth.

Henry II. is praised by Bromton, William of Newbury, and Gervase of Canterbury, for having commanded that shipwrecked persons should be treated with kindness, and for having forbidden, under heavy penalties, anyone to take their merchandise or goods from them. He protected the rising commerce of his kingdom more directly by enacting some of the earliest Navigation Laws. In 1181 he ordered the justices to declare in each county that no one should buy or sell any ship to be carried away from England, and that no one should induce any seaman to take service out of the country.

**Maritime Affairs  
under Henry II.**

In his reign London and Bristol became conspicuously the chief commercial ports of the kingdom, the former trading with Germany and the central parts of the Continent, and the latter with the Scandinavian countries and with Ireland. During the early part of Henry’s sovereignty, Ireland was still unconquered; but first by the efforts of private adventurers, who were little better than pirates, and finally by the exertions of the king himself, who invaded Ireland with four hundred large ships in 1171, the sister island was brought under some kind of subjection. This had the effect of greatly increasing the trade of Bristol, the merchants of

which soon acquired the reputation of being even richer than those of the capital.

Once more we find evidence of the increasing size of English vessels. The foundering of a single ship in the Channel in 1170 is said to have involved the loss of four hundred persons. Many commentators, who pin great faith to the contemporary representations of ships upon coins and in MSS., affect to believe that the statements of the chroniclers concerning the complements of the vessels of the period are exaggerated, but there seems to be little reason for this critical incredulity. The evidence of the coins especially has little or no value. Indeed, if we accepted all of it, we should be driven to the absurd conclusion that as late as the thirteenth century masted ships were often less than six feet long, and were so built that only by miraculous intervention could they be kept upright in the water. It is much more probable that all the representations of ships that have come down to us from the eleventh and twelfth centuries are purely and frankly conventional. It is tolerably clear, however, that ships still had never more than one mast, and that they were still, for the most part, very small and indifferently seaworthy.

The reign of Richard I. is, from a naval point of view, memorable in many ways. It witnessed the first distant maritime expedition that was ever undertaken by the forces of the realm, and the promulgation of the first laws for the government of the English fleet and merchant navy.

**Maritime Affairs  
under Richard I.**

It was at Chinon, in 1190, that Richard issued the ordinances which have been very fairly described as the basis of our modern Articles of War. These ordinances directed that if any man slew another on board a ship, he was to be fastened to the dead body and thrown with it into the sea. If the murder were committed on shore, the murderer was to be bound to the corpse and buried with it. If anyone were convicted by legal testimony of drawing his knife upon another, or of drawing blood in any manner, he was to lose his hand. For giving a blow with the hand, without producing blood, the offender was to be plunged three times into the sea. If anyone reviled or insulted another, he was on every occasion to pay to the offended party an ounce of silver. A thief was to have his head shaven, to have boiling pitch poured upon it,

and feathers shaken over him, as a mark by which he might be known, and to be turned ashore at the first land at which the ship might touch. Another ordinance strictly required every person to be obedient to the commanders or justices of the fleet; and, as they regarded themselves and their return to their own country, they were enjoined to faithfully observe these regulations.

Allied to these ordinances was the code known as The Laws of Oleron. It is generally ascribed to Richard, or to his mother, Queen Eleanor, *The Laws of Oleron.* but the greater part of it is probably of older date, and was merely confirmed by Cœur de Lion. The code did for the merchant service of the day what the ordinances above-quoted did for the navy; but it went much further. It consists of forty-seven articles, and its most interesting provisions are as follows:—If a vessel were wind- or weather-bound, the master, when a change occurred, was to consult his crew, saying to them, “Gentlemen, what think you of this wind?” and to be guided as to whether he should put to sea by the opinion of the majority. If he did not do this, and any misfortune happened, he was to make good the damage. If a seaman sustained any hurt through drunkenness or quarrelling, the master was not bound to provide for his cure, and might turn him out of his ship; but if the injury occurred in the service of the ship, the man was to be cured at the vessel’s cost. A sick sailor was to be sent on shore, and a lodging, candles, and one of the ship’s boys, or a nurse, provided to attend him, with the same allowance of food as he would have received on board. In case of danger in a storm, the master might, with the consent of the merchants on board, lighten the vessel by throwing part of the cargo overboard; and if they objected to his doing so, he was to act as he thought proper; but, on arrival in port, he and a third of his crew were to make oath that what had been done had been for the preservation of the ship; and the loss was then to be borne equally by the merchants. Before goods were shipped, the master was to satisfy the merchants as to the strength of his ropes and slings; but if he did not do so, or if he had been requested to make repairs, and damage resulted, the master was to make it good. In cases of difference between a master and one of his crew, the latter was to be thrice deprived

of his mess allowance before he could be lawfully discharged ; and if the man, in presence of the crew, offered reasonable satisfaction, and the master still persisted in discharging him, the sailor might follow the vessel to her destination, and there claim wages as if he had not been sent ashore. In case of collision by a ship under sail running on board one at anchor owing to bad steering, if the former were damaged, the cost was to be equally divided, the master and crew of the latter making oath that the collision was accidental. This law was aimed at dishonest owners who put old and decayed craft in the way of better ones. All anchors were to be indicated by buoys or anchor-marks. If a pilot, from ignorance or otherwise, failed to conduct a ship in safety, and if the merchants sustained damage, he was, if he had the means, to make full satisfaction, and if not, to lose his head ; and if the master or any one of the mariners cut off his head, the executioner was not to be held answerable ; but before recourse were had to this fatal measure, it must be ascertained that the pilot had not wherewith to make satisfaction. This rule was aimed at a class of rascally pilots who purposely ran vessels ashore in places where by custom a third or a fourth part of wrecked ships belonged to the lord, with whom the pilots had, of course, an understanding. Nor were the wrecking lords themselves forgotten. A plunderer of wrecks was to be tied to a post in the middle of his own dwelling, and his house was then to be burnt over his head, its walls to be demolished, its site to be converted into a pig-market, and the man's goods to be confiscated for the benefit of those whom he had robbed. People who, "more barbarous, cruel, and inhuman than mad dogs," murdered shipwrecked persons, were to be ducked in the sea and then stoned to death. Goods floating ashore were to be kept for a year or more, and, if not then claimed, to be sold by the lord, and the profits distributed as marriage portions to poor maids, and in other charitable ways.

The ships with which Richard carried on his distant operations were of several types. The largest were galleys, sometimes, if of great burden, called "dromons," although the name dromon was also applied loosely to any large vessel. The "buss" was a bluff-bowed capacious craft, chiefly used as a transport or store-ship. The "galion," or "galliass," was a swifter and smaller galley. The "visser," or "urser," was a

1216]

flat horse-boat. The barge was probably a small vessel used for carrying goods. Snakes, or "esnecca," seem to have been light and swift passenger boats. And the "cog" was apparently a large ship, either naval or mercantile. The galleys were long and low, with seldom more than two banks of oars, and with a mast and an above-water spur. The largest of Richard's galleys in the Mediterranean in 1190 had thirty oars. The rudder had not yet been introduced, and steering was still effected by means of the paddle or *clavus*, worked on the ship's starboard quarter. The *clavus* was, however, often attached in some way to the hull, and was provided with a cross-head or yoke, very similar to that of a modern boat's rudder. The larger warships carried not only engines for the projection of darts and stones, but also Greek fire, and certain squib-like explosives called "serpents." They seem to have fought under the banner of St. George, which from that time became the flag of England, although it was more than once temporarily supplanted.

In this reign there was added to England the first of her distant foreign possessions by the conquest of Cyprus in 1191, but Richard speedily sold **Naval Expeditions.** his acquisition to the Knights Templars, and, **1189-1199.** when they insisted upon his taking it back again, gave it to Guy de Lusignan. After he left the island for Palestine, the king became the hero of a naval action, which, since it was the first since the days of Alfred in which an English monarch bore part, and since, moreover, it illustrates the naval methods of the period, should be mentioned here. Nicolas has compiled the following graphic account of it:—

"On the 7th of June, when near Beirut, an immense ship was discovered ahead. This vessel, which was the largest the English had ever seen, excited their wonder and admiration. Some chroniclers call her a dromon, and others a buss; while one of them exclaims, 'A marvellous ship! A ship than which, except Noah's ship, none greater was ever read of;' and which he afterwards calls the 'Queen of Ships.' This vessel was, they say, very stoutly built, had three tall tapering masts, and her sides were painted, in some places green and in others yellow, so elegantly that nothing could exceed her beauty. She was full of men to the incredible number of fifteen hundred; among whom were seven emirs



and eighty chosen Turks for the defence of Acre: and was laden with bows, arrows, and other weapons, an abundance of Greek fire in jars, and two hundred most deadly serpents prepared for the destruction of Christians! Richard directed a galley, commanded by Peter de Barris, to approach and examine the stranger; and was told that the vessel was going from Antioch to the siege of Acre, and belonged to the King of France, but that the crew could neither speak French nor show a French or other Christian banner. Being further interrogated, they varied from their story, and pretended to be Genoese bound for Tyre. Meanwhile an English galleyman had recognised the ship as having been fitted out at Beirut while he was in that port; and in reply to the King's question, he said, 'I will give my head to be cut off, or myself to be hanged, if I do not prove that this is a Saracen ship. Let a galley be sent after them, and give them no salutation: their intention and trustworthiness will then be discovered.' The suggestion was adopted; and, the moment the galley came alongside of the ship, the Saracens threw arrows and Greek fire into her. Richard instantly ordered the enemy to be attacked, saying, 'Follow and take them, for, if they escape, ye lose my love for ever; and if ye capture them, all their goods shall be yours.' Himself foremost in the fight, and summoning his galleys to the royal vessel, he animated all around by his characteristic valour. Showers of missiles flew on both sides, and the Turkish ship slackened her way; but, though the galleys rowed round and about her in all directions, her great height and the number of her crew, whose arrows fell with deadly effect from her decks, rendered it extremely difficult to board her. The English consequently became discouraged if not dismayed, when the king cried out, 'Will ye now suffer that ship to get off untouched and uninjured? Oh shame! after so many triumphs, do ye now give way to sloth and fear? Know that, if this ship escape, every one of you shall be hung on the cross or put to extreme torture.' The galley-men, 'making,' says the candid historian, 'a virtue of necessity,' jumped overboard, and, diving under the enemy's vessel, fastened ropes to her rudder, steering her as they pleased; and then, catching hold of ropes and climbing up her sides, they succeeded at last in boarding her." (The use of the word "rudder" here is surely a mistranslation.)



"A desperate conflict ensued: the Turks were forced forward; but, being joined by those from below, they rallied and drove their assailants back to their galleys. Only one resource remained; and it instantly presented itself to the king's mind. He ordered his galleys to pierce the sides of the enemy with the iron spurs affixed to their prows. These directions were executed with great skill and success. The galleys, receding a little, formed a line; and then, giving full effect to their oars, struck the Turkish ship with such violence that her sides were stove in in many places, and, the sea immediately rushing in, she soon foundered. All her gallant crew, except fifty-five, who were spared from no worthier motive than that they would be useful in the construction of military engines, were either drowned, or slain by the inhuman victors. So much importance was attached to the destruction of this ship that it was said that, if she had arrived in safety, Acre would never have been taken."

King John has been called the Founder of the Royal Navy of England. He does not deserve the title, which could only be given with justice to a monarch who had created a navy where

**King John and the  
Rise of the Navy.  
1199-1216.**

none had been before; and it is impossible to mention any year in which, or any document or act by which the navy was established. But John merits the credit of having very greatly improved the service and of having devoted very careful attention to it throughout his reign. He seems, moreover, to have been the first English sovereign to retain seamen in permanent pay and to pension officers for wounds, and the first to seriously assert the dominion of the Narrow Seas. The pay of his galley-men was sixpence, and of his mariners threepence a day; and he found the crews of his ships in provisions, including herrings and bacon, and in wine. Moreover he introduced the practice of paying men a certain portion of their wages in advance, previous to sailing. He had a number of ships of his own, in addition to the vessels which were supplied, according to the provisions of their tenures, by the Cinque Ports and by other maritime towns; and some of them must have been of considerable size, for crews of seventy men were not uncommon, and there are records of vessels, described as "small ships," which were, nevertheless, capable of carrying as many as fifteen horses.

Upon occasion both ships and men were impressed, but there was also a system of hire of vessels and of voluntary enlistment of seamen, and a regular roll was kept of vessels which were permanently liable to be called upon for service. The reserve of ships thus constituted was administered by districts, each district embracing four or five ports, and being under the superintendence of an officer of rank. In 1205, the king's and the reserve ships made up a force of over one hundred sail. The general efficiency of the service was encouraged by a custom which had the effect of giving to the seamen one moiety of all prizes captured from the enemy. The prizes really became the property of the king, and were either sold, or added to the navy; but the royal bounty always awarded prize-money, and, dating from John's reign, there are many records of its payment.

William de Wrotham, Archdeacon of Taunton, was, in these matters, the king's right hand. He is variously designated as Keeper of the King's Galleys, Keeper of the King's Ships, and Keeper of the Seaports; and he carried out many of the functions of a modern First Lord of the Admiralty, Controller of the Navy, and Admiral Superintendent, as well as those of a Master of the Ordnance. He had something to do with the original establishment of Portsmouth as a dockyard and arsenal. In May, 1212, the Sheriff of Southampton was ordered to cause the basins at Portsmouth to be surrounded with a strong wall, as the Archdeacon of Taunton would direct, for the preservation of the king's ships and galleys: and he was also ordered to cause penthouses to be erected for the stores and tackle of the vessels.

Selden is the authority for the statement that John claimed the sovereignty of the seas. Selden quotes a folio MS. "Commentary on Affairs Concerning the Admiral." But Selden is not the only authority. Sir John Borough and Prynne refer to it or to other MSS. to the same effect; and although nothing is known of the originals, that fact is not, in itself, suspicious; for many very important naval documents of as late as the first half of the seventeenth century have long since mysteriously disappeared, and nothing at all would now be known of them, had not their contents happened to be promptly committed to print. The ordinance, which •

Selden printed, was translated, by him, as follows:—"If the governor or commander of the king's navy, in his naval expeditions, shall meet on the sea any ships whatsoever, either laden or empty, that shall refuse to strike their sails at the command of the king's governor or admiral, or his lieutenant, but make resistance against them which belong to his fleet, that they are to be reputed enemies if they may be taken; yea, and their ships and goods be confiscated as the goods of enemies; and that though the masters or owners of the ships shall allege afterwards that the same ships and goods do belong to the friends and allies of our lord the king; but that the persons which shall be found in this kind of ships are to be punished with imprisonment at discretion for their rebellion." Whether the document may have been genuine or not, it is intensely interesting as purporting to be the earliest evidence of a claim which was afterwards proudly and gloriously enforced by the English Navy during several centuries. There is no doubt that in the first half of John's reign the Narrow Seas were policed as they had never been before. To claim the dominion of them, therefore, would not have been unnatural on the part of the Power that spared no pains to keep them safe and open to the commerce of all nations.

IN no department of life was the Norman's policy of "thorough" better carried out than in the matter of architecture. This was the work of William's spiritual mercenaries, who in intelligence, in discipline, in everything save numbers, were immensely superior to his lay soldiery. Nor were they numerically an insignificant body, for during the whole reign of the Conqueror (and under many of his successors) Norman and French and Italian priests were pouring into England. It was part of William's general scheme for the Normanization of the country, everywhere to plant the foreign ecclesiastic by the side of the foreign soldier. Nor were the details beneath his personal supervision. As he had fixed on the larger towns as his principal places of arms, so he determined that these should also be the principal places of religion; and it was for the more effectual carrying-out of the principle of the

R. HUGHES.  
Norman  
Architecture.

double garrison that he promoted the transfer of the bishops' seats from the small to the larger cities of their dioceses.

Wherever the imported ecclesiastic came from—whether he was an Italian, like Lanfranc; a Piedmontese, like Anselm; or a Norman, like Ralph the Torch—he had invariably a passion for building. The first thing, in fact, that we usually hear of the foreigners who supplanted Englishmen in English sees and abbacies is, that they set about rebuilding their cathedral or abbey churches. For this purpose the entire English fabric was usually pulled down; sometimes, if the new church was built on the site of the old, the crypt was spared; more often a Norman crypt was begun. It may have been effected later or earlier, but later or earlier every one of the English cathedrals disappeared. They were, of course, buildings of various merit; a few, like Winchester, being considerable structures of stone, while more were only partly of stone, some wholly of wood. Some dated from the time of Wilfrith and Benedict, others belonged to the revival under Dunstan, most were of the time of Canute or the Confessor. But the contempt for the rude and primitive Romanesque of the Saxon seems to have been universal, and whether the work was of the time of the recent Eadward, or of the ancient Æthelfrith, it was equally English, and as such swept away. In country districts, of course, the architectural extermination was not so rapid: there was no such clean sweep of the English parish churches. This was due partly to the want of funds at the disposal of the local priesthood, partly to their want of architectural skill. In some few cases the Norman was even fain to rebuild in the Saxon manner, or only to add a Norman story, as at Deerhurst, or a Norman tower, as at Monkwearmouth. As a result, during the early days of William we have some buildings in the new style, some in the old, and some of a mixed character.

A very few new churches were also built at this time in the Saxon manner. At Lincoln, for instance—where William and Bishop Remi took, practically, the whole of the old town on the top of the hill, for the new castle and the new minster and monastery—the Saxon inhabitants were driven to the marshy land that lay in the valley. Here, while aloft the cathedral and castle were rising, they erected St. Peter's and St. Mary le Wigford—churches which resemble in general character, and indeed long passed as, typical Saxon. At Lincoln, therefore,

1216]

we find genuine fragments of Saxon style built wholly in the time of the Norman, as at Westminster we have a genuine fragment of Norman style built wholly in the time of the Saxon. Both are Roman in origin, though the Norman style was, perhaps, the noblest form of Romanesque, as the English or Saxon was, perhaps, its **The Norman Debt to Rome.** meanest manifestation. Both, as we have said, are Roman, but the Norman shows its lineage most perfectly. The Norman round arch, supported on piers, is seen in the great aqueducts which the Romans built in France, in Spain, and in Italy. The round-headed apse is simply the ending of the Roman basilica. The Norman triforium (or first story) and the Norman **Norman Ecclesiastical Architecture.** clerestory (or second) are but developments of the architecture of the amphitheatre. In the matter of the central tower there is perhaps more originality, though here we have timidly-applied hints taken from the architects of St. Sophia and San Vitale, and the Frankish Cæsar's copy of San Vitale at Aachen.

In plan the Norman church was invariably a Latin cross. At the beginning the nave was supported by vast square or oblong buttresses, sometimes rounded into stumpy columns. Plain vaults without ribs for the narrower spaces, wooden roofs for the wider ones, were universal. The arch was either not recessed at all, or only once recessed, or with the plainest round mouldings along the edge. The decoration did not get beyond simple arcades, with a sparse decoration of shallow zigzag or lozenge fretwork; and all this worked with the axe, the use of the chisel being unknown. The capitals are also very plain—the upper stone square, the lower stone a hemisphere with the top of the sides chopped straight (or, from the mason's point of view, a square with the bottom rounded), so as to produce the familiar cushion shape, and occasionally—as in the White Tower in London—with a feeble volute at the corners, or in the middle a Tau-shaped cross. The windows are round-headed, without shafts or mouldings, and rather long and small in aperture, and the doors square-headed under a round arch. The central towers are exceedingly low and heavy, the buttresses quite plain, and the porches shallow, the doorways being recessed in the thickness of the wall.

Simple indeed in every feature this Early Norman work is, but the low round arches, the enormous thickness of the piers or columns, the sternness and austerity of the decoration, are, it must be confessed, extraordinarily impressive. They look, as has been said of the work of Rome and Egypt, as if the builders meant to build for eternity, as if they meant to stamp on every stone the Norman pride in Norman strength. It is to be feared that the builders' motive was really less poetical. It was simply that, in imitating the wide-jointed Roman work, they were unable to make the adamantine Roman mortar, and recognising the untrustworthy character of their material, they gave to pier and column and arch a bigness that looks disproportionate to the weight it has to carry. The most distinguishing note of all in Early Norman work is the bad, wide-jointed masonry. The first Norman architects were, indeed, quite right; and when they laid aside this modest mistrust and attempted anything ambitious they usually had reason to regret it. The fall of Early Norman structures was, in fact, exceptionally frequent. Thus the tower of Ely, the south arches at St. Albans, and the tower of Winchester, all fell. This last cathedral had been fourteen years building; and the tower, finished in 1093, fell in 1107, nearly seven years after the wicked Red King had been laid beneath it. It is, of course, impossible to disprove the popular belief that the vicinity of the body of the impious Rufus accelerated the fall of the tower of Winchester; but William of Malmesbury himself suspected that it was due to human clumsiness, rather than to Divine anger. Some years later, probably about 1115 (the exact date is uncertain), the tower was raised again. It is very low, but the piers on which it rests are enormous, and if they are as strong as they look, are capable of supporting three times the weight.

The Anglo-Norman tradition of the thick column, which we so much admire, was, in fact, a tradition of timidity, inherited from the time when the masonry was bad, and which persisted when, to use the words of William of Malmesbury, "the courses of stone were so correctly laid that the joint baffles the eye, and makes it fancy that the whole wall is composed of a single block"; for the bad stone-laying does not extend beyond the half-century that followed

The Norman  
Masonry.



1216]

the Conquest. By the end of that time the Crusaders were home again, having seen many men and the architecture of many cities, and their return is marked by a striking change not only in the masonry, but in the character and feeling of Norman work. We have seen how the chronicler is impressed by the improvement in the new masonry; still more striking is the change from plainness to profusion of ornament, from the most simple to the most elaborate forms of decoration.

Effects of the  
Crusades.

Our earliest pointed arch was probably formed by the intersection of two round-headed arches, an intersection which gives the perfect lancet form. It first appears as a decorative feature only, as in the ornamental arcade at Canterbury, built about 1110 A.D., when Ernulf was prior, and repeated by him a few years later at Rochester, when he had been elevated to that see. But as an element of construction, even of the most simple kind, the pointed arch does not appear until the second period of the Norman architecture—that is, until the end of the first quarter of the twelfth century. In this respect the Norman architects were a long way behind some of their Continental brethren. Pointed arches had been in use in the South of France—a country through which many Crusaders passed—for more than a century, and they are found in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, built by them after the taking of Jerusalem in 1100. It therefore becomes probable, though not strictly provable, that the constructive pointed arch was also brought to England by the warriors of the Cross. It was, apparently, first used here about 1125 by Bishop Roger of Salisbury, who rebuilt the cathedral of Old Sarum. Not a stone of that edifice remains *in situ*, but there are pointed arches of his in the Abbey of Malmesbury, where they stand on massive Norman piers, and where the work is in other respects of the plainest Norman character. They appear a little later at St. Cross's Hospital, built by Henry of Blois, the brother of King Stephen, where, too, the intersecting round arcades form lancet windows in the triforium. Henceforth, to the end of the century, the round arch and the pointed arch are used indiscriminately, until, in the last days of the transition from Norman to Early English, the round arch is definitely

The Pointed Arch.



abandoned for construction, and when retained, retained only as decoration. The richest Norman work coincides with this time of indiscriminate use, though it must be borne in mind that the presence of the pointed arch is not necessarily—nor, indeed, at all—associated with any special richness.

Of this period, perhaps the most beautiful and characteristic features which remain to us are the doorways and arches, both lay, as at Bristol, and ecclesiastical, as at Itfley. They are generally very deeply recessed through the whole thickness of the wall, strand after strand of moulding running round the head, and being carried down on each side, and in many cases there is not a square inch of stonework which is not overlaid with ornament. The sculpture is also very deep and clean, and executed with the chisel, the use of the axe having been now definitely abandoned. The crane's-bill or beakhead, the cat's-head, the bead course, the medallions with figures, conventional foliage, or flowers, and the rosette—all are lavished in inexhaustible variety, and in combination with the old forms of the lozenge, the zigzag, the sunk star, and the round roll or billet. The piers now cease to be plain, and the columns grow taller, and twisted and banded shafts make their appearance. The windows come in for a share of the decoration. They are divided, and in some cases of the true lancet form, though the intersecting arches are still present. Round lights also appear; at first, mere circular holes, but later the wheel-like beginnings which in time will develop into the perfect rose. The plain cushion of the capitals, which early took the scalloped form, become, with the advance in style, laden with ornament. The volutes are more openly copied, and a sort of feeble Etruscan filigree pattern often runs over their square faces. Such are the main characteristics of the later Norman. It is not, of course, possible to date accurately the beginning or ending of any form of architecture; but dividing Norman into two periods of "early" and "late," we may approximately close the early period in A.D. 1120 (or fifty-four years after Hastings), allotting to the later period the next space of fifty-four years. This brings us to 1174, which is the date of the great fire at Canterbury, a disaster to which English architecture is immensely indebted.

1216]

The restoration of Canterbury, undertaken by William of Sens in 1175, undoubtedly marks the beginning of the transition, the mixed style which belongs both to Norman and to Early English. It is not by the presence of the pointed arch alone that it is distinguished; that, we have seen, was common forty years before; but in the work at Canterbury we have not alone the free use of the pointed arch, but the budding of the pointed style, and we see that style in almost full bloom before the work is finished. By a fortunate accident the progress of the building has been recorded almost from year to year by a contemporary. The work of the first year is almost pure Norman in its detail, but it gradually changes, particularly after the death of the French architect, until at length every accessory, every moulding, every ornament, seems Early English. The Romanesque column, however, remains, and a debased Corinthian or composite capital, borrowed probably from French examples. The builders of Canterbury were, in fact, pioneers, and the success which they achieved in the Metropolitan Church gave a great impetus to pointed work throughout England. Moreover, the superiority of the pointed to the round arch, as a means of vaulting over large and unequal spaces, was undeniable, and helped to drive out the Norman style. Soon the pointed arches began to be preferred for their own sake, and we find them adopted in places where the round arch would have served as well or better. Another indication of the transition is to be found in the form of the windows, which now are frequently pointed without and round within, as at Oakham Castle, and with shafts at the sides, and with the violette, or dog-tooth ornament, the typical decoration of Early English. So, too, we now find round arcades enclosing pointed lights, as at St. Hilda's above Whitby, and clustered pillars approaching the Early English form, as at Byland Abbey.

But besides examples such as these, in which the pointed method is generally triumphant, though the round arch holds out in decorative features, there are others where the exact converse occurs. Of these the Galilee, or west porch, at Durham is an instance, and, indeed, the most notable instance, where, to speak, the body remains perfect Norman, while the soul of

**The Transition to  
Early English.**

**Canterbury.**

**Durham.**

the building is perfect Early English. Bishop Hugh of Pusey, its builder, who was only appointed in 1180, died in 1197, and this very fine and expensive work must be attributed to the early days of King Richard, or the very last of King Henry. It was built in the interests of female worshippers, that they might have a place whence they should have the comfort of contemplating the holy places, which the stringency of the monastic rules did not permit them to enter. Certainly they are beautifully housed. The Norman round arch is used throughout, and the chevron ornamentation is also strictly Norman. Each of the arches springs, or sprang, from a tall and slender pier, though, perhaps, pier is hardly the right word to describe the two elegant shafts of Purbeck marble, of which alone each pier originally consisted. These have been altered for the worse; but the small forest of tapering stems, carrying the lightest of all stone arcades, remains, and is as graceful as any work of the later Gothic, and as far removed from the clumsy strength of the Early Norman. Mr. Freeman speaks of its Saracenic grace, and it is impossible not to feel the justness of the epithet. It was the very last word of the Norman style, and it must be owned that it was inimitably spoken.

The extraordinary architectural energy which had marked the twelfth century showed, perhaps, some abatement at the very beginning of the thirteenth. This may well have been due to the phenomenal rapacity of Richard and John, which, falling heavily on all owners of property, seriously affected the religious houses, and made the Jews, who financed their building operations, unwilling to give evidence of wealth which might exasperate the royal extortioners. But the reign of John, which saw the birth of the chartered liberties

**The Early English  
Style.**

of the nation, was also destined to see our first purely national architecture attain its majority. This, which we know as "the Early English style," actually came into being a little earlier, viz., in the reign of John's brother Richard, and is the one good thing that accrued to England under that most execrable of all our monarchs. Its birth was presided over by Hugh of Dauphiné, Bishop of Lincoln, commonly called St. Hugh of Burgundy. He died in 1200, and was buried behind the high altar in his unfinished church. His work is remarkable in two ways: first, because it is the first example of pure

pointed Gothic (of Gothic, that is, without the least tincture of Romanesque) to be found in England, and not in England alone, but in all Europe; and, secondly, because though there is a youthful, we might say a girlish, delicacy about it, it is neither tentative nor immature. All the true characteristics are present. We have the clustered shafts, the elegant crockets (conventional out-curved leaves), the pointed trefoil arch, the narrow lancet-shaped windows, the stalked foliage of the capitals. The history of the transition, of course, makes it certain that it was, in fact, a case of evolution, and not of a sudden separate creation; but the casual looker-on would certainly be justified in thinking that the Early English style, like Pallas from the head of Zeus, sprang full-grown and full-armed from the brain of the architects at Lincoln and Ely. This is true of St. Hugh's choir at Lincoln, built in the last ten years of the twelfth century; it is emphatically true of the Galilee at Ely, built in the first fifteen years of the thirteenth century, than which no more perfect example is to be found in the world.

The greatest and most important works in this noblest form of Gothic, such as Salisbury, belong indeed to the next generation—to the reign, not of John, but of his son. But the smaller structures to which we have referred do not yield to them in beauty, and show how completely the style of the Transition, no less than the style of the Norman, had, at this early date, become extinct. In twenty years, or thereabouts, there has been more than a change; there has been a complete and final transfiguration. Instead of heavy arches and solid piers, imposing chiefly by their mass, light clusters of delicate shafts charm us by their airy grace. Pointed arches carry, and pointed arcades decorate, the walls, and possibly some of the high wide roofs have exchanged their flat boarding for springing vaults of stone. Instead of the minute and laborious, almost missal-like, ornament of the Norman carver, we have the free, almost naturalistic, rendering of flower and foliage. Instead of the Norman beads, we have the violette. The shallow square and chamfer of the Norman mouldings is abandoned for boldly-cut rolls and fillets, and deep shadowy hollows in infinite variety. The eye is no longer kept down to earth along the horizontal Norman lines; on the contrary, every-

thing points heavenward; verticality is the law of the new order. The round arch has gone, not to reappear for centuries.

Great as was the change effected by the substitution of the Norman cathedral for the English church, it probably excited less wonder in English eyes than the substitution of the Norman castle for the English burh. It does not appear that prior

Norman Secular  
Architecture.

Castles.

to the Conquest anything in the nature of a real stone fortress existed in England, and the famous French antiquary, M. de Caumont, by an exhaustive examination of the sites of the Norman castles whose owners fought at Senlac, ascertained that the same holds true of Normandy also. Like the English, they trusted to wooden walls and earthworks, fortified by stockades and defended by a deep ditch or moat. But these defences, however strong against assault, easily fell a prey to fire, and it was doubtless this consideration that induced the Conqueror, not only to erect stone castles himself, but to encourage his great tenants to imitate his example. There is, indeed, evidence that some even of his earliest fortresses were of wood, for we read in Domesday of places like Stafford, where *rex percepit fieri castellum quod modo destructum est*, and this could hardly have taken place by any other agency than fire, a means of destruction obviously inapplicable to such a building as the Tower of London. We hear, too, later, of immense numbers of unlicensed fortresses (*castella adulterina*) rising in troublous reigns like that of Stephen, and being destroyed, literally by the hundred, when law and order were restored. These also must have been of wood; but that William and his great barons generally built in stone is attested by the remains that are with us to this day. Some of these, like Winchester and Lincoln and London, were royal from the first; others were the work of tenants *in capite*, and also were held to be possessions of the Crown; while the few to which the royal claims were more doubtful were gradually, by escheat and otherwise, reduced into the king's possession.

The architecture of the Norman castle was simple. In form it was by preference a rectangular keep, the sides varying from twenty-five to a hundred feet in length, and varying equally

The Plan of the  
Castle.

in height. At the corners the walls come forward so as to form square towers, the faces being usually relieved by a flat pilaster-like buttress. The walls at the base are sometimes as much as thirty feet, and at the top as much as ten feet, thick. Below was the store-room; higher up, to which access was given by narrow staircases made in the thickness of the walls, were the rooms for the garrison and for the owners, floors and roof being of wood. In every case a well was dug, some of these being of prodigious depth. Where practicable this keep was surrounded by a moat filled with water; and though, of course, this was not always practicable, a deep ditch of some sort was almost invariably a defensive feature. The doorway, which was small, and gave access only to a small portion of the interior, was defended by a drawbridge and portcullis, or some similar mechanism. But one peculiarity ever distinguishes these early castles from the more elaborate constructions of later times. They depend for their impregnability on the thickness of their walls, not on any series of fortifications or ingeniously-constructed *enceinte*.

The sites were selected with an eye solely to the subjection of the country, though, of course, the old strong places (natural and artificial) which had sheltered the Briton and the Saxon were not neglected by the Norman. The use of these older sites led, however, to a modification of the type of fortress. The formation of the natural rock, or the weakness of the artificial mound, frequently obliged the Norman builder to abandon his favourite plan, and erect his keep as best he could, so as to form a shell round the highest and most defensible ground. This is the obvious origin of the kind known as the "shell," as distinguished from the "rectangular," keep. But that the Norman used the "shell" form unwillingly—from compulsion, not from choice—is proved by the fact that while the rectangular form is found sometimes on an old, and sometimes on a new, site, there is no single instance of the adoption of the "shell" where the castle was erected altogether on new ground. This is true even of the small pele towers, the remains of which stud the northern Marches, and which are nothing but smaller editions of the great fortresses of Colchester and London. Of all specimens of military architecture, these rectangular stone castles are the grandest in outline. Most that survive



are of the date of Henry I., a reign most prolific of castles ; but very fine fragments remain of earlier masonry—such as the tower of Malling, built by Gundulf of Rochester, and considerable portions of London, Guildford, Bramber, Carlisle, Goderich, Walden, Wolvesey, and Colchester. There is but little difference between the earlier and later work, though at the end of the period under review the *enceinte* begins to play a more important part, and the round donjon, or Juliette, occasionally takes the place of the square Norman keep. But it was always something of a foreign fashion, and we have no early work in this style by English masons that compares in grandeur with the impregnable towers of Coucy.

We know little of the other lay structures erected by the Norman architects of the twelfth century. Most that have survived formed part of the monastic buildings, and, indeed,

**Chapter-Houses.** amongst them it is not improper to class the chapter-houses of existing cathedrals. The Norman, and, indeed, the very early English, form of these, was rectangular, and the few that remain show, as might be expected, that they conform to all the rules of the style in vogue. No doubt that wonder in its time, “the great Hall of Rufus,” which has practically disappeared, was a characteristic round-arched basilican structure, with a boarded roof and the cushion-capitalled cylindrical piers of the earliest days of the Norman style, just as Oakham Castle, with its richly-sculptured capitals, which remain, was an equally characteristic example of its latest development. But great kings like Rufus, and great nobles like Ferrers, were exceptions, and it would seem probable that the architectural energy of the Churchmen was not, except in regard to castle-building, at all emulated by the laity. Portions of a few manor-houses and one or two buildings which tradition ascribes to Jews, like “Moyses Hall” at Bury and “the Jew’s House” at Lincoln,

**Domestic Architecture.** survive, but they hardly exhibit any distinctive features. Probably the mass of well-to-do people continued to be content with wooden houses, and even the workers in stone seem to have been inclined to borrow wooden forms, as may be guessed from the exquisite external staircase at Canterbury, with its Norman balusters and arcades.



Of other arts there is not much to be said. The illuminators continue their delicate and laborious work, but though some of the specially **Illumination.** English forms of decoration are abandoned, there is no real advance. Nor, indeed, could we expect any so long as the illuminations continued to be executed by monks, in the scriptorium of the monastery, instead of being, as at a later date they were, the work of the artist in his studio. We have already called attention to the missal-like character of the Norman sculpture. With the transition greater freedom arrives, and in the Early English work we see flowers and foliage dealt with in a spirit that shows fine feeling, and the promise of still higher qualities. At the same time it remains the mere drudge of architecture, and almost the same is true of the decoration in polychrome and fresco, which were used—though exactly how, and to what extent, we do not know—from the tenth century onwards.

During the reigns of William and of his six successors the only English coins were silver pennies, and **Norman Coins.** these were issued in the most casual fashion. In some reigns no money at all was struck with the name of the sovereign upon it, Richard and John being satisfied to use, in England, the dies that bore the name and effigy of their father, although Irish coins of John, and Aquitanian coins of Richard have been found. They are all exceedingly rude, nor is there anything to choose in point of art between the earliest mintage that bears the head of the Conqueror, and the latest that bears that of his great-grandson. The Conqueror's coins resemble in style those of Harold and of the Confessor, being, in fact, bad imitations of bad originals. On the pennies of the two Williams evidence of their desire to pose as legitimate kings is supposed to be found, in the presence of the Saxon *p* in place of *W*. This letter in the hands of the Norman moneyer becomes transmuted into a *P*, so that both the Conqueror and Rufus appear as *Pillem* or *Pilhelm*. Throughout the whole period there is what seems meant for a portrait on the obverse, which, in the case of the two Williams, is usually of the most comical ferocity. They have very strange headgear, but the smooth face and moustache are well enough shown. There is usually, too, the sceptre and one or more stars, and on the back an ornamented cross with letters. The coins

vary a good deal in shape, some of the earliest being perfectly round, while, later, some are so irregular as to appear to have been clipped with shears. The most interesting series belongs to the reign of Stephen, when they were coined, not only by the king, but by great lords like Robert of Gloucester, by great Churchmen, like Henry of Winchester, by the king's sons William and Eustace, and by the Empress Matilda. The most interesting of these metal documents is one on which we read Stephen's name, and which shows two figures holding between them a lance topped by a fleur-de-lis. These personages were for a long time identified with Stephen and Henry Plantagenet, and the piece was supposed to have commemorated the Treaty of Wallingford. It is probably of slightly earlier date, and represents the king and his queen, Matilda, and may have been struck by that energetic lady while fighting for her imprisoned lord. Unfortunately, there is not a single coin of these princes which exhibits the least knowledge of the medallist's art, or possesses the limited element of beauty attained, four centuries earlier, under the Mercian Offa.

THE religious reformation of the eleventh century, which set the Latin Church once more on a career of victory, was accompanied by an intellectual movement not less penetrating in its results upon the history of education and the formation of human thought. The awakened interest in religious matters led at once to inquiry into the meaning of theological doctrines. It was from religious scruples that Berengar of Tours, towards the middle of the century, came to analyse the grounds on which the accepted doctrine of the Holy Communion was believed; and though in his attack upon the doctrine of Transubstantiation he left but few followers, still by virtue of the resistance he aroused, and the stimulus which was thus given to intellectual activity, he is rightly reckoned among the first pioneers of the scholastic philosophy. For the issue, on the one hand, broadened into a contest touching the claims of reason and authority, and on the other was diverted into a discussion as to the nature of the subject-matter of logic. In the

**R. L. POOLE.**  
**Learning and**  
**Science.**

**Theology and**  
**Philosophy.**

controversy concerning the Holy Communion Berengar was opposed by Lanfranc, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. The logical dispute was brought into prominence some years later by Roscelin of Compiègne, who applied his conclusions to the explanation of the doctrine of the Trinity, and was answered by Anselm, likewise afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. In his old age he was resisted by his own pupil, Peter Abailard, who sought to occupy a middle ground between the two schools of logic; but so soon as he entered on the study of theology, ranked himself boldly on the side of those who set reason above authority, and through his teaching and influence roused the strenuous opposition of St. Bernard. The whole controversy, logical and theological, is included in the century that elapsed between the first teaching of Berengar and the last condemnation of Abailard by the Council of Sens in 1141. Whichever side had the better of it in argument, the opinion of the time adjudged the prize to the supporters of the received tradition—to Lanfranc and St. Anselm unhesitatingly, to St. Bernard with some wavering. On the logical question of dispute, though St. Bernard did not permanently succeed in resisting Abailard's new dialectical method of treating theologic discussion, still for the moment the battle was won, and the conquerors were the *Realist* advocates of authority, the beaten were the *Nominalist* or partly *Nominalist* asserters of the supremacy of reason. To understand these terms we must glance for a moment at the method of teaching in practice at the time.

The elements of education were embraced under two heads: *grammar*, which dealt with words and their combination into sentences; and *logic*, which was concerned with the combination of sentences in discourse and reasoning, and thus fell into the two branches of *rhetoric* and *dialectic*. The three *arts* of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic were ranked side by side, and formed the *Trivium*, or first course of training in the schools, and the name logic was commonly appropriated by dialectic. The <sup>The Trivium and</sup> ~~second~~ <sup>Quadrivium.</sup> or more advanced course was the *Quadrivium*, which comprehended *arithmetic*, *geometry*, *astronomy*, and *music*; and the three and the four together made up the Seven Liberal Arts, so designated, not because they

were deemed to cover the whole field of human knowledge, but because they were regarded as the most proper studies for every educated man—in contradistinction to the professional faculties of *divinity, law, and medicine*.

Such a scheme of education gave no place for the study of philosophy, except so far as it could be embraced in logic, and consequently a branch of training requiring the most matured powers of the mind was thrust in among the rudimentary arts of the Trivium. For logic, it was clear, involved metaphysics, and it was on the metaphysical basis of logic that the whole scholastic problem turned. The main object of controversy was the nature of *universals*. On the one side it was urged that logic was in fact concerned not with mere *words* but with *things*. The exponents of this the accepted doctrine—the Realists—maintained that when we use terms denoting a class, *e.g.*, white things, the whiteness which we attribute to all of them is a real thing or sub-

**Nominalism and  
Realism.**

stance. The Nominalists held, on the contrary, that the particular thing only is real, and that the universal is a mere name, the creation of our own minds to express that which we have inferred from the comparison of observed facts. The one school proceeded from the highest and broadest conceptions of which the mind is capable—from the ideal, which to it was the only reality. The other held fast by experience, which declared only the individual. The difficulty of the Realist was to reach the individual. Could the individual be said really to exist? Was it not rather a bundle of attributes? This school had, however, the advantage in the readiness with which its principles could be brought into accord with the doctrines of the Christian Church—above all, with those of the Trinity, and of the change of substance in the sacramental elements. The Nominalist, on the contrary, grounding himself on the dictates of reason, was inclined to arrogate for this a far higher rank than his opponents would allow; and logic, as the method which controlled the exercise of his faculties, became for him, not the mere “handmaid of theology,” but itself “the science of sciences.” Although by the middle of the twelfth century the Nominalists had been practically beaten out of the field, yet the Realism which remained supreme was profoundly modified in the course of the long

debate; and through the fact that this debate had been necessarily conducted by means of logic, the importance which the Nominalists had claimed for the method was silently accepted by their opponents, and logic continued throughout the Middle Ages the dominant study of the schools.

It has already been said that logic from the first was applied to the examination of theological truths, and it was doubtless the result of the discrepancy of the conclusions at which Berengar, Roscelin, and Abailard arrived, with the accredited statement of those truths, that the school which opposed them won so unmistakably the upper hand. But as the Nominalist view of logic affected that of their rivals, so too did the logical treatment of theology acquire a currency which powerfully influenced its subsequent study. It was nothing new to compare and balance dogmatic passages from the Bible and the Fathers of the Church which at first sight might seem to contradict one another; but when Abailard in his "*Sic et Non*" arranged such passages side by side, classified under the proper heads, men felt at once that this was to expose the weak points of traditionary theology to the obvious attacks of the untrained or malicious. As a matter of fact, the systematic ordering of the discordant "*sentences*" was merely designed for the convenience of disputants; the logical method had become the method of theological discussion; and though Abailard's book was condemned, its plan was taken up, and became the model for the leading text-books of the schools. The "*Sentences*" of the Englishman Robert Pullan, and of Abailard's disciple Roland (afterwards Pope Alexander III.), are types of the appropriation of the dangerous method by the most orthodox divines. They contain theses or questions briefly stated, with arguments from the Bible and the Fathers, and conveniently arranged for use in a syllogistic form. But these and others of the same date were soon superseded by the "*Sentences*" of Peter Lombard, afterwards Bishop of Paris, which remained for more than three centuries the standard text-book of the European schools, the work upon which every candidate for a theological degree was obliged to lecture, and from whose classification the whole systematic theology of the later Middle Ages took both its form and its colour.

The earlier text-books of the mediæval schools were almost all the productions of the later Roman Empire. **Classical Literature in the Twelfth Century.** Priscian and Donatus supplied the grammar; logic was learned from Aristotle, mainly through the versions and paraphrases of Boëthius, and, most of all, from a meagre compend attributed to St. Augustine; and the whole circle of the liberal arts was studied in the obscure rhetorical allegory "On the Marriage of Philology and Mercury," by Martianus Capella, the treatise "On the Arts and Disciplines of Liberal Learning," by Cassiodorus, and the "Origins" of St. Isidore of Seville. This last work provided also a summary of historical knowledge, but the popular school history was that of Orosius; and to some extent the other text-books of the silver age had become superseded by the brazen epitomes of Alcuin, the English counsellor of Charles the Great. The minor works of the Venerable Bede, especially those on rhetoric, metre, chronology, and cosmography, were widely used by more advanced students. Models of style were found in the Church Fathers, above all in SS. Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great, and in the Vulgate or Latin Bible of St. Jerome.

Of any knowledge of the Greek language beyond the ninth century, to which by a singular fortune it had survived in the tradition of the Irish schools and of their descendants on the Continent of Europe, there is in the West no certain trace; for all supposed vestiges of it prove to be derived from glossaries copied from older texts. But the better classical literature of Rome was by no means forgotten; or, if forgotten, was rapidly recovered in the ages which followed the revival of the Roman Empire by Otto the Great in the tenth century. In the twelfth, to judge by its most brilliant exemplar, there was not much of that literature which lay altogether beyond the range of knowledge. John of Salisbury, indeed, seems to have been ignorant of Plautus, Lucretius, and perhaps Catullus; but he was familiar with Terence, Virgil, Horace (not, however, his "Odes"), Ovid, Lucan, Statius, Juvenal, Martial, Persius, and a number of later poets. If he had read little of Cicero's "Orations," he knew his philosophical works intimately; and he was well acquainted with Seneca, Quintilian, and the two Plinies. With historians he was more poorly supplied. Cæsar and Tacitus were names to him, and Livy he cites but



once; but Sallust, Suetonius, Justin, and, more than all, Valerius Maximus were constantly at his hand. No doubt his resources made him dependent to a great extent upon the later classical writers—Gellius, Macrobius, Apuleius, etc.—but the range of his reading was certainly superior to that of most professed Latinists of the present day. Such learning was, without question, unique in the twelfth century; but the fact that it was possible is proof that the mass of Latin literature in attainable manuscripts was far greater than is commonly supposed. It need hardly be added that for educational purposes a very small selection of it was asked for.

Yet the variety, the elasticity, of educational methods was probably greater in the twelfth century than it became when teaching was more highly **The Universities.** systematised in Universities. It was often enough the teacher who made the school, not the school the teacher. A single man might, by his own personal attraction, create, as it were in a moment, a new centre of teaching. The material wants of the mediæval student were few; he could move easily from place to place, with little baggage; and he asked only for house-room. We read of multitudes being drawn together by the lessons of Abailard, and building for themselves wattled huts round the place where the master taught. Sometimes a band of scholars, excited by some grievance, or moved merely by the spirit of novelty, would quit their school in a body, and from such a migration might spring a permanent new school, or even a University. But in order to understand the distinctive meaning of the word "University" we must glance for a moment at the educational arrangements which preceded the more complete organisation known by this name.

The cathedral churches and monasteries had, as a rule, schools attached to them, and these supplied to the children of the neighbourhood at least the rudiments of education, though in practice probably only those intended for the clerical profession were sent to them. Where no school existed, the parish priest might undertake the duty, just as John of Salisbury, in Henry I.'s time, was handed over to a clergyman's charge "to learn his Psalms"; but in regularly established schools the teaching was entrusted to a particular member of the cathedral or collegiate body, who was called the *scholasticus*. In England commonly the place of the *scholasticus*



was taken by the cathedral chancellor or the archdeacon; and this officer came in time to regard himself as too important a dignitary to devote himself personally to the work of giving daily instruction. He therefore employed a deputy, and it is in his official authorisation of teachers to do his work that we find the origin of the academical degree; for as the schools grew in popularity and in the numbers of students attending them, the need arose for several or many masters, all of whom required the recognition of their official chief. He gave them the "licence to teach," and this *licentia docendi* continues to the present day the essential element in the degrees in Arts conferred in the English Universities.

At the first the grant of this licence was a matter of favour, but the Lateran Council of 1179 made it obligatory to confer it upon all properly qualified scholars. Everyone now who desired to rank as a man of learning found himself compelled by usage to seek the licence, and the ambitious rivalry of the eager students of the twelfth century made its possession not merely a privilege but a necessity; for the licences of the most famous schools gradually acquired a European prestige, and became a passport to the master who wished to support himself by teaching. The stages by which the acceptance of the qualification became universal are obscure; but so soon as a licence held good everywhere, we have reached a condition of things in substance exactly identical with that in which the evidence of an academical degree is considered a sufficient warrant of a liberal education; and the degrees conferred at the present day by others than Universities—by the Pope, for instance, or the Archbishop of Canterbury—are practically a continuation of the ancient licence modified by the analogy of academical graduation.

After the licence was granted, the new master at once proceeded to enter upon office. This he did—first, by the delivery of a lecture, and secondly by taking his seat (*cathedra*) among the established teachers of the place. A feast, given to them at his expense, concluded the ceremony. We have here the second main element in the formation of a University—namely, the existence of a society of masters who claim to have their say on the admission of a new member to their body. At first, no doubt, the society was of an informal character, but it gradually acquired an

organisation. It became necessary for the masters to protect themselves against the possible competition of unqualified teachers, who might by some means have obtained the licence, and to secure the observance of an accredited system of study against wanton innovation. In this way there arose at Paris, not long after the middle of the twelfth century, a brotherhood or guild, or *universitas*, of masters, who by degrees succeeded in securing to themselves control over the method of teaching in the city, and over the reception into their body of other licensed masters.

A University, so far as the name is concerned, connotes no pretension, as has been supposed, of universal, encyclopædic study; it might busy itself with arts and theology (as at Paris) or with law (as at Bologna). The word means simply a corporation or organisation of any sort. The phrase *Noverit universitas vestra* in a mediæval deed is nothing but the forerunner of the modern "Know, all of you"; it might be addressed equally to the chapter of a cathedral church or to the body of merchants in a town. The special meaning only came with time. At Paris it was the teachers, at Bologna the students, who organised themselves for their own protection; and they were spoken of in the aggregate as the *universitas magistrorum* or *scholarium*. By an easy transition the *universitas* was used by itself to designate the organisation, but the proper name for the University, considered as a seat of study, was not *universitas*, but *studium*.

The migratory habits of mediæval students have already been referred to. They were hardly checked by the formation of more and more permanent places of education. It was possible for students to leave their country, or to quit their school and remove to another land, for the universal use of the Latin language made any famous school of the Middle Ages international in a sense in which no modern school or University can be; and it is likely that the University of Oxford itself took its rise from a migration of a large body of English scholars at Paris about 1167. There is no evidence to connect the University of Oxford with any conventual school, or the students of that University with the disciples of any of the previous teachers whose work is recorded in that place. Theologians like Theobald of Étampes and Robert Pullan, and

The University of  
Oxford.

the lawyer Vacarius—whose presence at Oxford in the first half of the twelfth century is not quite satisfactorily attested—left, so far as is known, no tradition either of teachers or learners. It is of a sudden, about 1170, that we find at Oxford the beginnings of a population of students, and tradesmen whose dealings imply such a population; and from these students grew up the University. About 1186 Gerald of Wales was able to read his “Irish Topography” “before a vast concourse at Oxford, where the clergy in England chiefly flourished and excelled in clerkly lore.” Still, until past the end of the twelfth century, Paris remained the school to which Englishmen preferred to go for the higher ranges of their education.

Among the earlier English scholars on the Continent after the Norman Conquest, Adelard of Bath claims the first place. He belongs to the beginning of the twelfth century, before the Paris schools had attained their undisputed supremacy, and his studies in France are said to have been carried on at Tours and Laon. He is one of the first of English travellers, and made acquaintance not merely with Spain, Sicily, and Greece, but also with the remoter regions of the Mohammedan world. That he learned the Greek language is doubtful, but it is certain that he drew from Arab sources a knowledge of physical science, to which the scholars of his time were strangers. In this Arabic learning he stands almost alone, but his studies in philosophy and dialectic do not seem to have profited by it, though in his day the works of Aristotle in their entirety were accessible only in Arabic translations. It was not until a later generation that they passed from the Arabic into common currency among Latin scholars.

John of Salisbury was, perhaps, fifty years Adelard's junior. Like him, he went to France, to gain admittance to a tradition of learning which had no counterpart in England. His first master, on the hill of Sainte Geneviève, in the southern suburb of Paris, was Peter Abailard. From him, in 1136, he took his first lessons in dialectics. Later on he removed to Chartres, where he entered into a field of humanistic scholarship which had been planted there by Bernard Silvester, and had grown up under his successors at the cathedral school, Gilbert de la Porrée and William of Conches. The philosophy of Chartres

was Realist, but it was not in its philosophy that its chief distinction lay, but in its philology in the old and large sense of the word. "We are," said Bernard, "as dwarfs mounted on the shoulders of giants, so that we can see more and further than they; yet not by virtue of the keenness of our eyesight, nor through the tallness of our stature, but because we are raised and borne aloft upon that giant mass." The study of classical antiquity was to him the indispensable basis of all true education. The Latin authors were to be read, not merely for their language, but for their sense. The style of different authors was compared in order that the pupil might find out for himself the qualities which make style. Nor was the value of the classics exhausted by their literary interest. Bernard was wont to use every art of illustration to bring out their hidden meaning and make their study an ethical as well as an intellectual discipline.

The noble influence of the School of Chartres was soon lost in the restless competition of the dialectic movement, but it held its power through life over the mind of John of Salisbury, who, after once more plunging into the dialectic stream at Paris, decided that logic, helpful as it was as an aid to other studies, by itself remained feeble and barren, and incapable of yielding the fruit of true wisdom. On his return to England he became secretary to Archbishop Theobald and his successor St. Thomas, whose exile for six years he shared. A theologian and ecclesiastic beyond reproach, John was also by far the most learned man of his time, and his writings reflect admirably the spirit he had caught from the humanists of Chartres, in which city as bishop he ended his years in 1180. Through a career of unceasing activity he maintained the scholar's tastes and habits and quick curiosity. The disciple of Abailard, he divined a middle course between the accepted tenets of Realism and the theological perils which underlay the qualified Nominalism of his master. With his mature and all-embracing learning he was able to assimilate the best elements of the philosophical discussions of his day, and reject their eccentricities and excesses. He has the virtues of the humanists of the fifteenth century, but he is free from their vices. Imbued as he is with the classical spirit, no man was ever less disposed to revive the intellectual or moral code of paganism. He would choose to be judged before all things .

as a divine, and his theology was unquestionably based upon an extensive Patristic learning. Sound as it was, its rigour was tempered not only by his devotion to the Platonic tradition, which he took as he received it, filtered through the teaching of many, but also by that calm moderation of judgment which marked alike his public life and the books into which he poured the abundance of his thought. Nevertheless later generations must be forgiven for judging him first as a scholar, for it is his scholarship which distinguishes him from others to whom his theology was common. His classical reading surpassed in depth and range that of any writer of the Middle Ages. He was always on the search for new manuscripts of his favourite authors, having transcripts made, and even translations from the Greek. It is likely that to his energy we owe the first introduction to mediæval students of the later books of Aristotle's "Organon." His correspondence is full of questions and points of classical interest. He was the literary adviser of all scholars, the central figure of the learning of his day.

Between John of Salisbury and even the most cultivated of his contemporaries there is a wide interval. Yet the record of English teachers and writers is a distinguished one, and their number daily increasing. Three of those whom John had known in his student years at Paris were of English birth—his masters, Robert of Melun and Robert Pullan (both authors of methodical compends of theology), and his friend, Adam of Petitpont. The second became a cardinal, the two others were rewarded by bishoprics at home. Later on, among many more, Walter Map the satirist, afterwards Archdeacon of Oxford, and Gerald of Wales, the cleverest critic of the life of his time, may be mentioned as English students at Paris. Those who proposed to study law, particularly archdeacons, thronged the schools of Bologna. King Henry II. himself was a pupil of the Chartres master William of Conches, and all through his life was fond of reading and scholarly discussion; but it did not need his patronage to

bring learning into favour. The Court of

**The School of  
Canterbury.**

Canterbury, under Archbishop Theobald, formed a rallying-point for scholars as well as a nursery of prominent churchmen. It was Theobald who brought over the Italian Vacarius to give lectures in his house

on Roman law, and these continued until they were forbidden by King Stephen. Here were trained the future Archbishops Thomas and Roger of Pont l'Evêque; John, Bishop of Poitiers and Archbishop of Lyons; Ralph of Sarr, Dean of Rheims. John of Salisbury himself was for many years an honoured member and guide of the society.

Nor did the Court of Canterbury stand alone. Every great man had his household and his chapel, and at least the houses of prelates were rarely without their circle of scholarly life and activity. Bishop Stubbs has sketched an imaginary tour of a foreigner on a visit to England in the latter years of King Henry II. He describes the learned men whom he might meet, and the historical, legal, philosophical works, the verses and satires, on which they were or had been engaged. The list is an astonishing one. "So far as books were concerned, there was such a supply of writers and readers as would be found nowhere else in Europe, except in the University of Paris itself."\* The familiar names of John of Salisbury, Peter of Blois, Walter Map, Gerald of Wales, and the whole series of historians whose writings make the record of the second half of the twelfth century perhaps the best-known period of the Middle Ages, are but samples of a type of culture that was universal in England; when in literary matters men talked and thought in Latin; when they read and studied widely and not without criticism, and wrote (unless they wished to be obscure) excellent Latin prose; and when their verses were only disappointing if they challenged comparison by the adoption of classical metres, their rhythmical poems having a vigour and fresh originality altogether their own.

Such, in outline, was the condition of learning in England at the time of the birth of the University of Oxford. In the next century it was profoundly modified by the growth of that University, by the extended knowledge of the works of Aristotle maturing the philosophy of the schools, and by the energy thrown into intellectual work by the newly-founded and rival orders of friars.

\* "Seventeen Lectures," pp. 145—154.



IN the long chain of events which makes up the history of a people, no one link is, in strict truth, more essential to the final result than any other; and yet from time to time events do occur which seem to sum up in themselves the character and tendencies of much that has gone before, and which, because they easily attract popular attention, are convenient termini for the historian. Such links are spoken of as critical. A crisis of this nature is marked in our history by the 14th of October, 1066, when the battle of Senlac was fought, and the old heroic thegnhood of England—which had been celebrated by many a “scop,” from the singers of the deeds of Beowulf down to him who sang the death of Byrhtnoð—fell before the knightly chivalry of Normandy. Harold and his trusty men, falling one by one upon the hill above Hastings, with their backs to the rampart they had left, slowly but inevitably crushed by the better method and equipment of their Norman foe, are as clearly typical of the inevitable fall of Germanic civilisation before the Romance in the eleventh and twelfth centuries as the victories of Crécy and Poitiers mark its rally in the fourteenth.

**H. FRANK HEATH.**  
**Literature.**

**Germanic and Romance: Influences.**

The Norman Conquest was no cataclasm in our history, for it was a sure outcome of the weakened national life under Edward the Confessor and his immediate forerunners; yet it introduced so much that was new into England, and so largely changed the direction of development in the old, that at first sight we seem confronted by a break in continuity. This is, however, more apparent than real, and we shall find the old methods in literature living on, though modified in form and no longer on the surface of the stream, but almost submerged by the flow of the new current. We must remember, too, that the substitution of a Norman for an English nobility, and the expulsion of the English from the higher ranks of the priesthood—the chief patrons, connoisseurs, and producers of the national literature—resulted in a very marked reduction in the amount of work produced and in a growing carelessness about the preservation of the old MSS., which the new abbots and bishops could not read and therefore despised.

At the same time the English priests and monks who were



1278]

left in office after the change of dynasty remained the chief defenders of the English element against the Crown; and as their secular patrons had disappeared, we find that the bulk of the vernacular literature in this period consists of religious works on Latin models. It is not till after the middle of the thirteenth century that the English made any attempt to rival the Normans in manner of life, for up to that time their whole energies were absorbed in the struggle for national existence, and in consequence it is not till after that date that we find any serious attempt to follow them in such a detail as literary excellence. Leaving, then, for the present any nearer view of works written during this time in the mother tongue, we shall first consider what the new elements were which the Normans introduced.

It is to be remembered that these people were Germanic in origin, Danes, or Scandinavians, like those who had harried and settled in England since the eighth century. They had settled in the North of France, had rapidly won recognition for themselves from the French king, and with more startling rapidity had adopted the language and culture of their new country.\* They were a people of extraordinary earnestness and intensity, with a power seldom equalled of assimilating and making their own what was best in their surroundings. Withal, they were intensely practical; their motto was "Deeds not Words," and they had none of the emotional excitability which we have learnt to associate with the modern French character. It is, then, only to be expected that the art and literature of such a people should reflect the national character. And so, in truth, it does. When the victory of Senlac came to be sung, it was not by an Englishman, in the long alliterative line which had told of the struggle against the Danes at Maldon, but by a man of Jersey named Wace, who, in the same measure as that of the "*Chanson de Roland*,"† told how, as the Norman lines moved up the hill to the attack—

**Norman-French  
Poetry.**

**Wace.**

\* The grandchildren of the warriors who had conquered Rouen under Rollo in 912 had forgotten the language of their forbears.

† The oldest surviving MS. of this great French epic is one written by a Norman settled in England, in the Anglo-Norman dialect.

“ Taillefer, qui mult bien chantont  
 Sor un cheval qui tost alont  
 Devant le duc alont chantant  
 De Karlemaigne e de Rollant \*  
 E d'Oliver e des vassals  
 Qui morurent en Rencevals.”

*Roman de Rou*, ll. 8035-40.

These few lines can teach us much about the changes which that battle inaugurated. They show us that Norman-French, the Court language, became, at least to some extent, a literary language—the medium used by poets who appealed to the barons and the princes of the Church as their public. They show us that the French national epic verse was a measure of short rimed couplets—not based on a rhythmical system, like the Old English, but with lines of eight syllables, four of which were accented—a form of verse which was adopted in English in the thirteenth century. And, still more significantly, they show us how different was the Norman poet's method from that of the old “scop.” In this poem of the “*Roman de Rou*,” and even more markedly in the earlier “*Chanson de Roland*,” we see all the severe simplicity characteristic of the Norman race. The narrative is simple and straightforward, leading the reader on from point to point, with none of that tendency to shift the point of view and to repetition which makes it difficult for the Old English poet to advance in his story. The epithets may sometimes seem wanting in power and originality, but at least they are never far-fetched, as those of the Old English poet too often were. His simplicity and somewhat narrow horizon save the French poet from all “conceits,” and restrict him to an even sparer use of metaphor and simile than the English poet allowed himself. What the French epic lost in variety of treatment, it gained in unity of composition and firmness of outline, whilst passages like that describing the death of Roland† are unsurpassed for power of conception and heroic passion, and scarcely excelled in the grim earnestness of the battle-scenes by anything in the whole range of Old English poetry. Of the Norman-French poets in England Wace is the typical representative. Without

\* This must refer to some old ballad of Roland, for the “*Chanson de Roland*” was not written in cantabile form.

† “*Chanson de Roland*,” ll. 2375-96.

1216]

the depth of thought or heights of passion to be seen in the "Chanson de Roland," his laconic logical method, his smooth verses, and clear, temperate, and not ungraceful diction, reflect the practical, serious, and cultured nature of the Norman race. His work, however, is no longer national epic, which the "Chanson de Roland," in spite of romantic contaminations (such as Saracens, reliques, etc.), undoubtedly is. The "Roman de Rou" is Romance, which name implies less earnestness, less characterisation, more sentiment, and more room given to the trappings and mere machinery of the story. All this it will be necessary to remember when we come to deal with English work produced under Norman-French influences.

It was, however, the practical side of the Norman character which was naturally most prominent at first, and the bulk of the literature produced after the battle of Senlac dealt with either religious, scientific, or historical subjects. These books, being intended for instruction, were written in the universal language of scholarship—Latin—and the large majority dealt with the third of the three branches of learning mentioned.

Among the religious works of this time were Archbishop Lanfranc's "Liber Scintillarum" (c. 1080), dealing with the doctrine of Transubstantia-  
Religious Literature.  
 tion; Anselm's "De Incarnatione Verbi," "De Voluntate," and "De Concordia Præscientiæ et Prædestinationis," etc.—a work of great depth. A large number of Lives of the Saints were also written, one of which, the "S. Malchus" (c. 1120) of Reginald of Canterbury, is interesting because it is written in leonine hexameters. Laurence of Durham wrote a Bible history called "Hypognosticon" (c. 1150) in graceful Latin distichs; and the historian, Henry of Huntingdon, who also wrote lyric and didactic verse, produced eight books of Epigrams.\* In this last kind of writing Godfrey of Winchester (died 1107) was the most skilled stylist at that time.

The most famous man of science of the day was Æthelward, or Adelard (*see* p. 340), of Bath, a keen and  
Scientific Books.  
 bold thinker, deeply read in the science of the Arabians. He translated Euclid, and wrote a number of treatises, among which were "Quæstiones Naturales," a book of

\* According to Leland, "De Scriptoribus Britannicis," p. 198.

physical science, and "De Eodem et Diverso," an allegorical argument for reason instead of authority as the final appeal.

When we turn to the historical works, it is not so easy to obtain a clear general view in any moderate space. We shall find, on the one hand, that under this head we must take into view productions both in Norman-French and in English, besides those in Latin, which, it is true, form the large majority. On the other hand, there are at least five different kinds of historical writing to be distinguished, and in dealing with the last of these we shall find ourselves in a domain where the books have far more interest and worth as literature than as science.

The various kinds of historical writing which should be distinguished are—(1) biography, (2) history proper, (3) chronicles, (4) annals, and (5) pseudo-history. To which of these classes any particular work rightly belongs, the title used by the author is often little guide—and, indeed, the same work may be in one part little more than biographical, in another a chronicle, in a third no better than annals, and in a fourth mere pseudo-history. Under history proper must be understood a work of art which attempts to set forth events in their deeper relations of cause and effect. The only two writers who did work worthy of this name in the period were William of Malmesbury and his follower and disciple, William of Newburgh. Chronicles made no attempt at selection or artistic arrangement, but gave a careful account of acts and an orderly arrangement of dates. "Imagines Historiarum" they are called by Ralph de Diceto, quoting Cassiodorus. The English Chronicles and the "Gesta Regis Henrici II. et Ricardi I.," ascribed to Benedict of Peterborough, are good examples. Another most important distinction between the chronicles or the annals, and history proper, lies in the fact that the author of the latter *used* his authorities, throwing the whole work into his own literary form and diction, whilst the chroniclers and annalists were never original, except in describing contemporary events, copying for the earlier periods passages wholesale and word for word from the various books at their disposal. Sometimes they would compress, at other times enlarge, and often adopt as a whole, but with no claim to originality, except, as said, for contemporary events. It will be easily seen that the history, being an

artistic work, produced in accordance with some theory of events, and dealing with them from this point of view, is not of such permanent value to the future historian as the chronicle, which only recorded facts in an orderly way. As literature, however, the history ranks higher than the chronicle, and its value is as permanent as that of any work of art. Annals are imperfect chronicles, mere jottings of events without any attempt at connecting them. Such are the two continuations written at Canterbury of the Winchester Chronicle. (*Cf.* Table on next page.)

By pseudo-history must be understood the skilful romancing under the guise of history introduced by Geoffrey of Monmouth, and continued by his translators and adapters down to Robert of Gloucester (in the earlier part of his chronicle) towards the end of the thirteenth century. There was, of course, a good deal of pseudo-history—in the form of legends, miracles, pure invention, etc.—incorporated into the historical works of writers before Monmouth. The pseudo-Nennius, his chief source, so far as he had any, is a good example. In the same way Monmouth's history of the Britons was afterwards accepted as historical material by uncritical writers like Henry of Huntingdon and the writer whose MS. Walter of Coventry used; but these are not, therefore, pseudo-historians. The proportion of truth can alone decide under which category any particular work falls.

It will be impossible here to do more than mention in detail the most important historical works of this time.

At the very outset we see in the continuations of the Old English Chronicle of Winchester—which were made in the abbeys of Canterbury, Abingdon, Worcester, and Peterborough—an evidence of the continuity of prose-literature in the mother-tongue, at any rate down to 1154;\* for with the exception of the bilingual version made at Canterbury (MS. F) and the second continuation of MS. A, they are all written in English alone.

\* The Peterborough, the longest continuation, ends at this date. Each of these abbeys had of course made, direct or indirect, copies of the old Winchester Chronicle, which they continued. (For the relations of the various continuations to each other, and to the original source, with date of ending, time of writing, etc., *cf.* Table on next page.)



One of these continuations (that of Worcester), together with the "*Chronicon Universale*"\* of Marianus Scotus, a monk of Fulda in Germany, Asser's "*Life of Ælfred*," and Bede's "*Ecclesiastical History*" were the chief sources of information for Florence of Worcester's "*Chronicon ex Chronicis*," extending to the year 1117, and which afterwards received two continuations of much less value, bringing it down to 1295. Of more value is Simeon of Durham's "*Historia de Gestis Regum Anglorum*" (to 1129). Eadmer of Canterbury, besides his "*Historia Novorum*" (1062—1122), wrote a valuable "*Vita Anselmi*"; and ecclesiastical history found another exponent rather later in Ordericus Vitalis (1075—1143), author of the "*Historia Ecclesiastica*," in thirteen books, extending down to 1143.

Henry of Huntingdon (c. 1083—1155), poet, chronicler, and historian, was Archdeacon of Huntingdon, as his father, who was probably of Norman blood, had been before him. His "*Historia Anglorum*" † is not so valuable a work as that of his great contemporary, William of Malmesbury. The part of highest value is that dealing with the time in which he lived, and that immediately preceding it, of which he could learn through witnesses whom his position gave him many opportunities of questioning; but he cared more for attractive gossip than for accurate research, more for drawing a moral than for giving facts. He had ambition, literary taste, and intellectual quickness, but little perseverance, and less accuracy or judgment. If he wanders less from the subject than his contemporaries, it is because the material he used was scanty, and there was less temptation to stray. It used to be thought that he made use of many Old English popular songs; for in his description of battles in the fifth and sixth centuries he always adds picturesque details to the accounts in the English Chronicles, but close investigation shows that he drew on his imagination for these. He found Old English of even the tenth century hard to translate, and makes astounding mistakes in rendering the Battle of Brunanburh. He is important in the development of historical writing as the last translator of the English Chronicles and the first to accept

\* Not to be confused with the "*Chronica Mariani Scoti*," a later work.

† There were five editions of this work, the last of which brought the account down to the death of Stephen.



Welsh tradition and romance without question—a bad precedent.\* The epigrams occurring in the history are probably from his hand, and the eleventh and twelfth books are wholly poetical.

William of Malmesbury (1095 to c. 1143) was a south-country man, monk and librarian at Malmesbury, and, like William of Huntingdon, of mixed race. He was the first writer in England since Bede who made any attempt to digest the mass of material at hand, and to produce, by connecting cause and effect, a symmetrical work of wide view and ripe conclusions. The writers before him were mere chroniclers, with no conception of an articulated history. He was a man of sound judgment and cultured taste, and in consequence shows great love for delineation of character. He has considerable power of tracing the tendencies of important events and the development of political institutions. He is wonderfully broad-minded and free from party-feeling, in sympathy with Normans and English alike, while his work is made bright by humour and sharply-pointed remarks. His "*Gesta Regum Anglorum*" in its third edition brings the history down to 1128; but the fifth book, as well as his "*Historia Novella*" (to 1142), commenced in 1140 as a sequel to the "*Gesta Regum*," are little more than rough drafts, intended, had life lasted, to be re-written and re-arranged. He also wrote a *Life of Aldhelm*, and seventeen other works.

William of Newburgh (1136—1208), who emulated the methods of Malmesbury, wrote an "*Historia Rerum Anglicarum*" (from the Conquest to 1198), a trustworthy work. Except the first few pages, the whole is devoted to his own time, but it is not so completely original as was once thought. He clearly made use of Simeon of Durham, Henry of Huntingdon, the "*Itinerarium Regis Ricardi*" of Richard the Canon, and a lost work of Anselm the chaplain.

Giraldus Cambrensis or Gerald de Barri (1147—1223), surnamed *Silvester* (the Savage), a strong and passionate Welshman of Pembrokeshire, was many-sided, with great power of observation and clear thought, but not free from vanity or superstition. He wrote on theology, politics,

\* He copied at Bec in 1139 an extract from Geoffrey of Monmouth, which formed the subject of his epistle to Warine, the second of three incorporated in the eighth book of his history.

1218]

topography, history, and on himself in his "*De Gestis Giraldi Laboriosis*." His other works are "*Expugnatio Hiberniæ*," an account of Henry II.'s conquest of Ireland, followed by a most valuable mine of information for historians called "*Topographia Hiberniæ*"; also a "*Topographia Cambriæ*," and a satire on the monks and the Papal authority with the title "*Speculum Ecclesiæ*." Such satire on the Church must not be taken as indicating any active desire for reform—the times were not yet ripe for a Wiclif—it is but one aspect of the melancholy and complaining tone so characteristic of mediæval literature. Similar in tone and tendency is the opening of the "*Polycraticus*" of John of Salisbury (b. c. 1120), who died in 1180 as Bishop of Chartres. This work, which was earlier than Gerald's, appeared between 1156 and 1159, and, after satirising the Court, proceeds to lay down a system of philosophy, learnedly reviewing those of the classical thinkers by the way, in a lively, well-written style.

Younger than John of Salisbury, less refined and learned, but more outspoken, witty, and worldly, though of high moral purpose, was Walter Map (c. 1137 to c. 1196), the friend and countryman of Gerald de Barri. Under the influence of John of Salisbury he gave a circumstantial account, full of the sharpest satire, of the Court and society of his day in his "*De Nugis Curialium*."\* Several Latin satirical poems, such as the "*Apocalypsis Goliae*," "*Praedicatio*," and "*Confessio*," and a number of twelfth-century Latin and French romances,† some of them dealing with the Graal and Arthurian legends have been ascribed to him.

These legends were first collected in England by Geoffrey of Monmouth, Bishop of St. Asaph (d. 1154), who in his serious-looking "*Historia Regum Britanniae* (written 1132—1135), combined the Franco-Breton form of the Arthurian legend with the more historic Welsh version, connecting his hero, who was really of North British origin, with the Welsh saint Kentigern, the founder of Glastonbury. Merlin, the prophet of Vortigern's Court, was, in the same way, a compound of many traditions. To Geoffrey we owe the stories

Geoffrey of  
Monmouth.

\* This was also the sub-title of the "*Polycraticus*."

† The "*Lancelot du Lac*" is generally supposed to be his.

of Gorboduc, Cymbeline, King Lear, and Sabrina. The Welsh were flattered by the Chauvinist spirit of the book, and the Normans were not displeased at a man who painted the English in no favourable light, whilst he gave to the whole all the local colour of Henry II.'s chivalric Court. So popular was it, in spite of the sneering attacks of William of Newburgh and Giraldus Cambrensis, that less than fifteen years after its issue Alfred of Beverley made an abridgment of it with a continuation to 1129, and about the same time Geoffrey Gaimar wrote an Anglo-Norman rimed version, the "*Estorie des Bretons*," now lost, as sequel to which came his "*Estorie des Engleis*" (to 1100). His version of Monmouth was soon cast into the shade by the more popular work of Wace (b. 1124), the "*Geste des Bretons*"—or "*Brut d'Engleterre*," as it is often called—written in 1155. The work, which is in rimed octosyllabic couplets, with the exception of a long section near the commencement, of later origin, in Alexandrines, introduces the theme of the "*Table Round*," an element found only in the Breton versions. It was Wace's book which served as basis for the greatest literary creation of this cyclus, the "*Parzifal*" of Wolfram v. Eschenbach. Of Wace's other works the best known is the "*Gestes des Normans*" or "*Le Roman de Rou*," spoken of already. Slowly the enchanting "lies" won their way, and gained credence even with the English, until the attractive but insulting story was rendered into English for the first time by Layamon, the western priest, living by Sabrina's stream. The "*Brut*" (c. 1205) of the Areley priest is more than twice as long as Wace's, on which it is based, with, however, only ninety words of Norman-French origin in the whole poem.

This comparative purity of the mother-tongue leads

us to notice that the influence of Norman-  
**Language.**

French upon it was rather of a negative than positive character. Some few sounds were modified, such as the gutturals, which were palatalised, and one or two new ones were introduced; but otherwise the result was only to hasten developments along lines which can be traced before the Conquest, but which were allowed free scope directly the old literary dialect of Wessex, with its controlling influence, was destroyed. After the Conquest

an increasing centrifugal tendency is noticeable, which was not to be checked till Chaucer came. The verse of the Brut is only another proof of the continuity of the old tradition, especially in the west country, for it is but a popularised form of the Old English alliterative line, with much greater freedom in the laws of alliteration, and, when alliteration is absent, a use of middle and end rime. This latter adornment, which had been sparingly used even before the Conquest, caused the original long line to be thought of as a short rimed couplet of irregular form. The old verse in purer form is to be found in a group of Lives of the Saints written about the same time, of which the two best examples are "St. Margaret" and "St. Juliana." Like these, written in the south, but very different and much more important, was a sermon in verse called "A Moral Ode," which may date back in its earliest form to the first half of the twelfth century. The poem is almost passionate in its depth of feeling, and is noble in tone, but the point of view is that of the Latin Church, not that of the old Germanic heroes. The simple, clear language shows Norman influence, and the verse is the iambic septenar (katalectic tetrameter) learnt from the Latin hymnology, and traceable to the measure of Terence and Aristophanes.\* This metre, without the coupled rimes of the "Moral Ode," is found again in a Lincolnshire version of the Church homilies by an Austin friar named Orm, who called his work the "Ormmulum" (c. 1205). The book <sup>The "Ormmulum."</sup> is quite without literary value, but the careful distinction made in the autograph MS. between long and short vowels (by doubling the consonant after a short vowel) and between the various pronunciations of the letter "g,"† makes it of great value to the philologist. The septenar found its way after

\* A comparison of the following lines—respectively from Terence's "Andria," a famous mediæval drinking song, and the first line of the Moral Ode—will show the same *rhythm* in each :—

"Per omnes tibi adjuro deos nunquam eam me deserturum."

*Andria*, IV. 2, ii.

"Mihi est propositum · in taberna mori."

"Ich eom nu eldre Ʒanne ich waes · a wintre and eac a lare."

*Moral Ode*, 4. 1.

There are seven beats in each line, and hence the name.

† Cf. Professor Napier, *Academy*, March 15th, 1890.

the middle of the thirteenth century into lyrical verse, and was a favourite form for "Robin Hood" and other popular ballads, influencing, together with the French Alexandrine, the old alliterative line in its popular developments.

The English prose-writing of this time is wholly religious, and the most important and interesting example is the "Ancren Riwle" ("Rules for Anchoresses"), written (c. 1210) for three sisters in a nunnery at Tarente in Dorsetshire. Besides the actual rules of conduct, the book contains much allegory and a remarkable description of the mystical love of Christ for the soul, and of the soul for Him, in the manner of the chivalric romance. This erotic note \* in the religious literature we shall trace in the lyrics of a rather later time. Meantime in the secular domain the French epic was making itself more and more felt, despite the warnings of good men like Thomas de Hales, who saw in their stories the world and the flesh, if not the devil.

THE agricultural system is portrayed for us in outline at the beginning of this period by the survey called  
**A. L. SMITH.**  
**Trade and Industry.**  
 Domesday Book, and in full detail by the Hundred Rolls. The latter display its completed form at the close of the thirteenth century, just before the changes which began the transformation to the system of modern times. The nature of the Domesday evidence is best indicated in the instructions to the Commissioners as recorded in the Ely Book. They were to inquire, among other things, how many ploughs were on the lord's demesne, and how many men; how many villans and cottiers in the manor, how many freemen and socmen; how much woodland, meadow, and pasture; how many mills and fishponds; the former and the present value of the land. These inquiries and the answers to them show that England was already divided up into manors: each manor contained both demesne (the lord's own land) and villan holdings. Villans made up the great bulk of the population. Free tenants were scarce, save in the eastern counties and the eastern midlands; and it is more natural

\* Cf. also "The Wohunge of ure Louerd," "The Wohunge of ure Leudi," "A god Oreisun of oure Louerd," etc.

to suppose that they represented a survival of the ancient freedom in these districts, invigorated by Danish settlements, than that they had only lately sprung into existence, and that serfdom had been the normal state of Saxon England. The number of slaves returned is small—some 25,000; and those chiefly in the south-west. The villans proper, with a normal holding of a yardland (thirty acres) or half a yardland, are distinguished from the lower villan class of *bordarii* or cottiers, who are named as holding sometimes only a cottage and garden, sometimes a cottage and a few acres, not often more than five, in the common arable fields. The normal villan would contribute a pair of oxen to the common plough; the cottier had no oxen of his own. The lord's plough of eight oxen, which tilled the demesne, was worked by the services of the villans; these, moreover, had often to do service with their own ploughs and oxen. This all implies a great number of cattle, for whom there was ample rough pasture. Hay meadows were comparatively rare and valuable. Woodland was plentiful, and was measured by the number of swine it could feed. It has been estimated that as much as 5,000,000 acres were under cultivation, about five-twelfths of the present cultivated area. This would tally with the population, which may be fairly estimated at about 2,000,000. It would also agree with the calculation that nearly one-half of the cultivated area was devoted to wheat, and that the production of wheat averaged about one quarter to the acre. Besides leguminous crops, a good deal of barley and oats and some rye was grown; while the absence of root-crops or any systematic manuring implies a great extent of fallow, perhaps nearly one-third of the total arable area.

It is not easy to realise how essentially this whole arrangement of rural life differed from that of modern times. The great mass of the agricultural population are now landless; in the eleventh and twelfth, and indeed down to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, they were landholders. The class of farmers, whether on leases or on yearly agreements, was then very uncommon, except on some Church estates. The relation between gentry and peasantry is now a mainly economic relation; in that age it was first and foremost a social and political relation. The villan must sit in his lord's court of justice,

**Contrast to  
Modern Times.**

and follow him to war, as well as till his lands. They were bound together by mutual obligations; the lord could no more dispossess him, whatever unreal maxims the contemporary law-books chose to enounce, than he could shake off his lord and escape from the manor. But perhaps the most striking feature of all to a modern mind is the universal prevalence of community in cultivation, if not in ownership. A village was, indeed, one large common farm. To take the most typical case, each of the three arable fields was "open"; it was not enclosed or broken up into severalties, but only roughly marked off by turf baulks into acre strips, of which every fifth strip might be the lord's, every tenth the parson's, and so on. The whole field would be ploughed, harrowed, sowed, and reaped, by the joint labour of all the holders. Each contributed, according to customary rules, his share of the labour, the oxen, the cost of the plough. A villan's holding of thirty acres might thus consist of thirty or forty detached strips scattered over a whole parish. Such a system was of course grossly wasteful; but it had grown up under needs with which economics have nothing to do. It was the natural outcome of a still ruder method of annual re-allotment of the arable strips; it was the expression of the old sense of kinship in the village community, and its cumbrousness was a determined effort to secure the absolute equality of each share. It must have had an immeasurable influence in silently moulding English character, drilling men into local self-government.

It is only within the last generation that Enclosure Acts have swept away almost the last of the "open" parishes. A few still remain. Fifty years ago they were still the majority. This singular tenacity perhaps implies that the system worked less badly than we should expect. No doubt, however, such a system helps to account for the low productivity of mediæval agriculture. This, and the imperfect means of communication and conveyance, explain the great variations in prices which prevailed in neighbouring markets. There was evidently frequent local scarcity, even when there was no general bad season. But no fewer than nine years of dearth are recorded in the contemporary Anglo-Saxon Chronicle between 1070 and

**Communal  
Husbandry.**

**Production ; Prices ;  
Expenses.**



1216]

1100. The only operation we hear much of for permanent improvement of the land was marling. On the other hand, orchards were common; a considerable quantity of native wine was made, and thirty-eight vineyards are mentioned in Domesday. Bee-keeping was universal, from the use of honey before sugar was known as a general mode of preserving food. Perhaps one of the greatest impediments to good husbandry was the great expense of iron. The cost of new irons to the plough is one of the chief items in bailiffs' accounts in the thirteenth century; and to avoid this, wooden ploughs and harrows were often used, and the soil was in consequence scratched rather than ploughed up. In fact, there was little improvement in the art of agriculture till the Tudor period introduced a better rotation of crops, more thorough and varied use of manures, and the employment of horses instead of oxen. It must be remembered, however, that dairy produce and poultry were cheap and plentiful throughout the Middle Ages.

The chief changes between Domesday Book and the middle of the thirteenth century can be best brought to view by selecting an instance from each of the chief documents which bridge over that interval.

In the *Liber Niger* of Peterborough 1125-8—to take the case of the first manor named in it—the normal holding of the villan was a virgate or “yardland” of thirty acres arable. Each villan has to plough in spring four acres for the lord. Each supplies two oxen to the plough-team, which was bound to be at the lord's call three days in winter, three in spring, one in summer. Moreover, each villan has to work for the lord three days a week, to pay a yearly toll of 2s. 1½d., a hen, and sixteen eggs. The cottagers, each holding five acres, render work of one day a week, besides twice a year making malt for the lord's use, and paying 1d. for each goat using the pasture. On this manor there seem to have been 1,253 acres of arable held by forty-three villans and eight cottagers; some 400 acres of arable farmed by the lord through a bailiff; a few dozen acres of valuable hay-meadow; a mill paying rent of 20s. a year; and an indeterminate but probably large area used for rough pasturage of the cattle, sheep, pigs, and goats, belonging both to the lord and to the villagers. The lord's demesne was tilled by the compulsory services of his men superintended

Changes between  
1085 and 1280.

by the bailiff. This one manor may be taken as typical of the twenty-five which are enumerated in the survey, and which constituted the estate of the abbey. In a few of the manors are found "socmen"—that is, freeholders, whose holdings might be no larger than those of the villans, but who would generally, instead of the heavy services, pay a fixed and not heavy rent.

In the Boldon Book, a survey made in 1183 of the manors of the Bishop of Durham, the chief differences from the above are that the services of carrying the crops, cutting wood, etc., are commuted for money payments, and that the cottagers' holdings are often as much as twelve acres each. Sometimes the whole mass of services was commuted for a fixed annual payment to the lord; *e.g.*, "the villans of Southbydike hold the township at a rent, paying £5 a year for it, and finding 160 men to reap in autumn and thirty-six carts to cart the corn."

The "Domesday of St. Paul's" (1222) shows that, besides the services, each villan paid in money and in kind a few shillings yearly to the lord, and that the number of free tenants had largely increased since the Norman Conquest.

The Register of St. Mary's Priory, Worcester, early in the thirteenth century, shows some further incidents of villan tenure. They could not, without the lord's leave, sell ox or horse, send their sons away or make them clerks, give out their daughters in marriage, or grind corn except at the lord's mill; and on a villan's death the lord could seize his best chattel, and impose upon the heir a "fine" at discretion. After this date there are innumerable similar documents—inquisitions, surveys, extents, cartularies, and manor rolls.

The period of Norman and Angevin rule initiated a great and almost sudden outburst of life and growth in the English towns. It is true that the immediate effect of the Norman Conquest was to bring disaster to the towns. The number of burgesses enumerated in 1086, as compared with that recorded for the reign of Edward, shows a falling-off of one-half (8,000 as against 17,000). The advent of a new Norman lord and the building of a stone keep roused the desperate resistance of the townsmen. In the consequent struggles their poor dwellings were cleared away to make room for the castle outworks, or were fired and wasted by accident or for punishment; and the town

1216]

pined under the labour and the dues exacted by the new lord. "In this town there are 478 houses so wasted and destroyed that they cannot pay any tax." This Oxford entry in Domesday Book might be paralleled from nearly every borough. But the Norman, almost from the first hour of his coming, gave more than he took. In his train came extension of trade-routes, intercourse with Norman and Breton, Poitevin, Gascon, and Spanish ports. Foreign merchants flocked to London and Winchester, to Ipswich and Boston and Lincoln. Foreign craftsmen settled everywhere, and all the trades of the mason, the carpenter, the glass-maker, the workers in metals, must have received an immense stimulus from the castles, cathedrals, and abbeys which began to arise everywhere in the new architecture. What we hear of Chester must have been true of many boroughs. It had suffered in the first years of the new rule, but by 1086 had recovered itself. "When Earl Hugh got it, there were 205 houses less than in King Edward's time; it had been grievously wasted. Now there are as many as he found when he came." At any rate, this was true of the towns as a whole long before the end of Henry I.'s reign. To the industrial classes, indeed, any exactions by their Norman sovereigns, if heavy in themselves, were but light compared with the relief from the insecurity and anarchy of Anglo-Saxon days, when even the stronger kings vainly bewailed "the manifold and unrighteous fightings that are daily amongst us." For the same Englishman to whom William seemed so "stark and wrathful" a man, greedy of gain, and the cause of much distress, has to allow that "the good order he made must not be forgotten; it was such that any man . . . might travel over the kingdom with his bosom full of gold, and no man durst kill another, however great the injury which he might have received from him." So, again, of Henry I.: "The misery which the land sustained by reason of the king's exactions cannot easily be recounted"; and yet "a good man he was, and there was great awe of him; no man durst misdo against another in his time; he made peace for man and beast." Nor was security of inland trade all that their new rulers could give. A charter from him who was Duke of Normandy and Maine as well as King of England; still more, a charter from Angevin kings, whose writs ran from Berwick to Bayonne,

Royal Charters.

could lay open a range of free trade hitherto unexampled. To be "quit and free from all tolls, dues, and customs, at fairs or otherwise, in all harbours throughout all my dominions, both the hither side and the further side of the sea, by land and by strand," gave new life to the fettered and crippled commerce of the country. Commercial growth led to heightened constitutional claims; and constitutional progress itself stimulated commercial growth. The freedom of the English towns grew out of their prosperity, and the most critical phase of their history thus falls within the period whose beginning and end respectively are marked by William I.'s charter granted to London, and the Great Charter extorted from John. This stage of their history was critical, because it determined the form which the municipal self-government should take. Hitherto the English borough had hardly been differentiated from the rural township. If it were too large to be treated as a single township, it ranked as a group of townships—that is, a "hundred." "This borough in payment of dues quits itself as a hundred" is the Domesday formula. All townships, and even some hundreds, had fallen into the hands of a lord. The same feudalising process had affected the borough. Boroughs in the later Anglo-Saxon period either belonged to one or more lords or to the king. By the side of the old moot, perhaps often supplanting it, had arisen the lord's court, in which the chief burgesses sat as the lord's vassals. This feudal character was for a time accentuated by

**The Gild System.** the new Norman lords, with their clear-cut theories of tenure, and their classification of townsmen with villan tenants. But the feudal aspect was soon to give way to the commercial. The "hanse" or gild began to appear in every considerable borough. These gilds were unions of the traders, for their own protection, for the regulation of trade, and, it must be added, for the exclusion of rivals. Without a royal charter they would be "adulterine" and liable to be broken up. But with a charter they could receive and enfranchise serfs, and impose their gild bye-laws on the whole borough. Thus Henry II. grants to the gild-merchant of Oxford that no one outside the gild shall do any trading in city or suburbs; to the Nottingham gild control of the cloth-dyeing trade is given for ten leagues around; to the Lincoln gild, general control of the whole body of traders

in the county. Hitherto the boroughs had aimed at two privileges, and two only, beyond the general ratification of their old local customs. These two were—the right to try in their own borough courts all but a few excepted cases, and the right to arrive at a verdict by the ordeal instead of the foreign method of “wager of battle.” But now, strong in the rapid growth of trade and the success of the gilds, the boroughs set to work to commute their taxes for a fixed sum, and to collect and pay this themselves into the Exchequer. This would oust the hated tyranny of the sheriff, and this was generally accomplished under Henry II., and still more under Richard I., “in whose eyes all things were saleable.” This step was decisive as to the future town constitutions. It was necessarily the gild to whom the Crown sold this privilege, and not to the ancient borough-moot, nor to the court of vassals. These were now antiquated; the gild belonged to the new era. There is a curious illustration of the jealousy with which it was regarded in the language used by Richard of Devizes condemning the recognition in 1191 of the gild as the governing body of London: “What evils spring from these communes can be gathered from the saying about them, that they mean an upheaval of the rabble, a menace to the kingdom, and a lukewarmness in religion.” The sign of this recognition was the allowing the borough to have its mayor. Thus the head officer of the gild became head of the town, the gild aldermen became his assistants, and the gild-hall the headquarters of administration. This became common in John’s reign; the other boroughs followed fast in the wake of London: *e.g.*, Leicester got its “commune” in 1251. Fortunately the boroughs still remained subject to the sheriff for certain purposes, such as “view of armour” and calling out of the militia, attendance before the royal judges on circuit, etc. Thus their position as part of the shire system was not lost—it was possible for them to sit in Parliament with the knights of the shire, instead of forming, as elsewhere in Europe, an estate apart; and to this was due the dual composition of our House of Commons and its unique indestructibility.

While the merchant-gild was becoming the governing body, the natural division of labour was at work to produce craft-gilds or associations of craftsmen, below the higher body and somewhat in rivalry

Craft-Gilds.

with it. This rivalry was, it is true, far less marked than on the Continent. But still, a rule is often found in existence by the thirteenth century, that no artisan can belong to the merchant-gild. We know that as early as 1130 there were weavers' gilds in several of the larger towns, and we find the merchants bribing John to revoke the weavers' charter, and the weavers buying it back again. After this date the craft-gilds succeeded in breaking down gradually the trade monopoly of the merchant-gild, and often in securing an independent jurisdiction for themselves.

The gild system, with all its restrictions, must not be judged by too narrow an application of modern economic canons. In an age when authority interfered everywhere, and when customers could do little to protect themselves, the gilds did much to inculcate a code of industrial morality; they came down severely upon short weights and measures, upon "shoddy" material and upon scamped workmanship. They also acted as benefit, insurance, and burial societies; and exercised social, educational, and even religious functions, besides the regulation of hours of work, processes of manufacture, and wages and prices.

Much of the energy of English trading life was directed towards the exclusion of foreigners from the internal trade of the country. Till the thirteenth century the exports of England, still consisting almost wholly of raw materials, were in the hands largely of foreign traders. It was to the interest of the Crown to give, or rather to sell, wide privileges to these men. Early in Henry III.'s reign the Hanse of the Netherlands can be seen as a strong organisation resident in London within its own walled fortress—the Steelyard—on the Thames bank, with its common hall and refectory, its Masters, each with his suit of armour, and its gates closed at curfew. A similar but rival organisation was the Teutonic Hanse, which had originated with the men of Cologne, but was amalgamated in the thirteenth century with the stronger Hanse identified chiefly with Lübeck and Bruges. These bodies soon came to have branch establishments in the provincial centres. Even the less organised companies of merchants from Florence, Lucca, and Piacenza, when they appear in the twelfth century, making purchases of wool

**Foreign Traders  
and Foreign Trade.**



1216]

at Boston and Lynn, and doubtless bringing southern and eastern wares in exchange, have clearly some defined status and corporate rights.\* A similar close connection with Genoa dates from the third Crusade. From Gascony, too, and from Lorraine came a large supply of wines. To meet the needs of this foreign trade, bills of exchange were introduced about 1200. But the great aim of English statesmanship was to secure a "balance of trade" for England in the form of silver. Henry of Huntingdon, in specifying the great cargoes of flesh and fish, wool, lead, and tin, that went to the Rhine, exults in the reflection that the Germans paid for these in silver, and that in consequence the English currency was of pure silver. The same mistaken views led to prohibition of the export of corn. For contravening this, Richard I. burned some English ships caught at St. Valery, and the town itself, and hanged the shipmen.

The internal trade of England depended chiefly on the great seasonal fairs. There were four such fairs a year at Cambridge. In 1189 it is mentioned that the Husting Court at London was suspended during the days that the annual fairs at Boston and Winchester were being held. During the seven days of St. Frideswide's fair at Oxford, the prior of that house had jurisdiction over the whole city. A court of "pie-powder" dealt out summary "merchant's law" in such assemblages. All other trading in the town or district was generally suspended while the fair lasted. The wooden booths were assigned certain spaces, and arranged in streets according to their calling—goldsmiths' row, furriers' row, etc. The greatest of all these fairs was Stourbridge (18th of September to 9th of October). Here merchants from Hamburg, Bruges, and Strasburg, from Rouen and Bordeaux, and from Florence and Genoa, all met. The farm bailiffs came hither to buy their annual stores of pepper, of iron goods, and of tar; and to dispose of wool and hides, cattle, corn, and hay. The manciples of Oxford colleges and distant abbeys came to buy the winter's provisions and stock of salt and spices, as well as Liège linen or Spanish wine, or furs

Home Trade.

Fairs.

\* A thirteenth century list gives 177 monastic houses from which the Florentines drew their wool supplies.



from the Baltic, or Flemish cloth. A concourse like this, which covered a space half a mile square, shows that means of communication and routes of traffic were in a very tolerable condition in the early Middle Ages. The dispersed character of the great lords' estates, and the flow of pilgrimage, helped to keep the roads good; and that they were good is shown by diaries of journeys and expenses (*e.g.*, from Oxford to Newcastle); by the moderate cost of carriage, even for heavy goods; and, finally, by the frequency of inns. It was not unusual to have public or charitable funds set apart for maintenance of important bridges and roads; besides that the common law laid this obligation on the parishes.

The rapidity with which trade and wealth were growing in this period may be measured by the case  
**The Growth of London.** of London. In Fitz-Stephen's contemporary description, written about 1174, its imports are gold and spices from Arabia, gems from Egypt, silks from India, furs from the northern lands, wines from France, and arms from Scythia. It had 139 churches. It had replaced Winchester as the capital; but its fighting force, given at 60,000 foot and 20,000 horse, must be reduced to perhaps one-tenth of those numbers. The citizens "ranked almost as nobles, for the greatness of their city." They elected their own sheriff and justices. They were, by royal charters, guaranteed their freedom of transit and of traffic, and their hunting rights in Chiltern, Middlesex, and Surrey. For the confirmation of these rights and the promise of the removal of weirs from the Thames and Medway they paid to King John £3,000 in 1199. It was the accession of London to the baronial side in May, 1215, that forced the king to sign the Great Charter. But London represented the high-water mark of municipal progress; few English towns of that age could have had a population above 10,000.

**The Chief Towns.** The most prosperous were Exeter, Bristol, Winchester, and Southampton, in the south; Chester, in the north-west; Dunwich, Norwich, and Lynn, in the eastern counties; Lincoln, Grimsby, York, Hull, and Newcastle, in the north. The coast towns were able to supply a fleet fairly numerous, though vessels of very small tonnage. Such a fleet was used by William I. in 1072 against Scotland, and by Henry I. in 1099 against his brother Robert. Henry II.

1218]

had begun the creation of a royal navy, independent of forced levies of private shipping; so that though Richard I. was able to muster many galleys of his own, yet his large fleet was chiefly made of ships impressed or hired from his subjects. His reign supplies other evidence of the increasing wealth of the country; for his ransom was set at 150,000 marks, and Hoveden even declares that Hubert Walter informed the king that in two years there had been sent him from England 1,100,000 marks (about £750,000)—an incredible sum, being about twelve times the yearly revenue of Henry II. One thing is, however, clear—that England was already becoming, with the single exception of Italy, the wealthiest of European States, and without exception the best-ordered as well as the freest of all.

As an index of the miserable conditions of mediæval life much has been made of the disease of leprosy. A good index of social misery it undoubtedly is, both for present and former times; but it is easy to over-rate its importance. England in the Middle Ages was by no means the unhappy land of lepers which we might suppose from the attention given to those sufferers. Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon in the reign of Henry I., calls his country "Merry England" (*Anglia plena jocis*); the English, he says, were a free people, with a free spirit and a free tongue, and a still more liberal hand, having abundance of good things for themselves, and something to spare for their neighbours across the sea. Precisely those boisterous animal spirits, that very love of sports and jests, of good-fellowship and the pleasures of life, which marked the "average sensual man" and were the dominant national character, served to bring out in strong contrast the humility, the abasement, the penances, mortifications, and morbid fancies of the religious few. As the history comes nearly all from ecclesiastics, we hear a good deal of the religious and morbid side of the national life; and in that connection we hear much of lepers, who were the favourite objects of religious care. The lepers were "Christ's poor," being named lazars, after Lazarus—indifferently the Lazarus whom Jesus loved, or the Lazarus who was laid at the rich man's gate full of sores. David, King of Scots, the son

C. CREIGHTON.  
Public Health.

of St. Margaret and of Malcolm Canmore, was also Earl of Huntingdon, and founded a leper-hospital there. Accordingly his biographer says of him that he was received into Abraham's bosom beside Lazarus, "whom he cherished." His sister Matilda, queen of Henry I., who founded the leper-hospital of St. Giles's, washed the feet of lepers, believing that she was thereby washing the feet of Christ Himself. The religious sentiment of the mediæval world has been contrasted with the joyous sentiment of paganism; but it was in actual contrast with the boisterous workaday spirit of its own time. It cared for those who were stricken, for the helpless in the struggle; and it showered caresses upon them, and treated them with morbid consideration or exaggerated devotion, just because these exercises of charity afforded the relief and effusion that it needed in a hard and cruel age.

The English leper-hospitals began to be founded after the Conquest. Lanfranc, who held the See of Canterbury under William of Normandy, built two hospitals—one for lepers, and another for the sick poor in general. Several hospitals for lepers date from the reign of Henry I., others were endowed by Stephen, others under Henry II., and still others as late as the reign of John, who, with all his odious qualities, was conspicuous among English monarchs as a patron of the lepers. The founders and benefactors were kings and queens, chivalrous nobles and pious ladies, bishops and abbots. The leper-houses were only a small fraction of all the charitable houses in England, perhaps a sixth or eighth part, and probably not more than fifty in all. One at Durham had accommodation for sixty lepers, men and women; Matilda's hospital in St. Giles' Fields, outside London, had a chapel and hall for forty lepers, who must have slept elsewhere; the hospital at Ripon, "for all the lepers of Richmondshire," had eighteen beds; that of Lincoln had ten beds; and the male leper-house of St. Albans Abbey had six beds. They were generally heavily staffed with ecclesiastics; some were for leprous and non-leprous patients side by side, three or four of the former to six or eight of the latter; others were for sick or "leprous" monks and priests, or for the same class when they "grew old, leprous, or diseased." As early as 1279 the leper-hospital of Stourbridge, near Cambridge, had been alienated from the leprous by the Bishop of Ely; inquisitions in the reign of

Edward III. showed that the leper-hospitals at Ripon, Oxford, and elsewhere, contained no lepers; at St. Albans, for some years previous to 1349, only one, or two, or three of the six beds could find leprous occupants; and in 1434 new statutes had to be made for the great Durham leper-hospital, by which it was provided that two beds should be reserved for lepers "if they can be found in these parts," in order to preserve the memory of the original foundation. In fact, even the few hospitals that were clearly designed, in whole or in part, for lepers were gradually diverted to other uses, and that, too, in some cases within living memory of their being founded; and although that may have been owing in part to the avarice of the clergy, yet it must have been chiefly because there was no further use for them as leper-houses, or perhaps because there had been from the first something forced and unreal in the chivalrous movement which started them.

Not only did several of the leper-hospitals provide in their charters for a majority of non-leprous patients, but even those inmates that passed as leprous were a heterogeneous class of sufferers—from chronic or incurable sores, eruptions, tumours, and deformities. It is clear that the medical writers about the beginning of the fourteenth century knew true leprosy when they saw it, and that they had described it from actual observation; but it is also clear that "lepers" were immured on the word of persons who had no skill in diagnosis, and that the terms *lepra*, *leprosus*, and *lazar-house* came to have very elastic meanings. But even with all that comprehensiveness of diagnosis, the extent of "leprosy" in Mediæval Britain cannot be called great: there might have been a leper in a village here and there, one or two in a market town, a dozen or more in a city, a score or so in a whole diocese. Thus, in the records of the city of Gloucester, under date of 20th October, 1273, three persons are mentioned by name—a man and two women—as being leprous and as dwelling *infra villam*, to the great hurt and prejudice of the inhabitants. The leper-hospital at Ripon, "for all the lepers in Richmondshire," made provision for eighteen. At no time in England was there leprosy to so great an extent as to make its ancient name of "Merry England" even a paradox. Leprosy is commonly supposed to come from bad food—semi-putrid fish or flesh; and in mediæval times, when fresh food

(except game for the lord or the poacher) was not to be had during many months of the year, and the salted food was often badly cured owing to the dearness of salt or the badness of it (the rock-salt of Cheshire was not mined until long after), it is easy to understand that individuals here and there among the English may have fallen into leprosy, especially if they had acquired a taste for flesh or fish in a semi-putrid state, a taste which is widely spread among many savage or half-civilised and leprous tribes at the present day. But the English have always had a high standard in diet; they preferred to eat no bread "that beans in were, but of cocket or clerematyn, or else of clean wheat—ne no piece of bacon, but if it be fresh flesh, other fish fried other bake." More particularly they avoided rye-bread ("black bread"), which was the staple food of the peasantry in France; and therewith they avoided perhaps the greatest of all the dietetic maladies of the Middle Ages—St. Anthony's fire or ergotism—from bread made of mouldy rye, a more destructive and painful disease even than leprosy, and one that figures even more than the latter, for all its Biblical vogue, in the French legends of the Saints.

If we assume that leprosy is rightly called a *morbis miserie*, and that it was due to corrupt food, one can readily believe that there was a certain amount of true leprosy in England at the time when the leper-houses were being founded; for the period was a troubled one, and it stands out in the annals as one of frequent famines and famine-pestilences. One great famine, attended or followed by universal sharp fever (typhus), occurred in the last year of the Conqueror's reign (1086-7); the chroniclers yield to the temptation of epigram when they say that the fever destroyed those whom the famine had spared, but they all speak of the mortality as enormous, and even William of Malmesbury for once descends from diplomacy and ecclesiastical history to make mention of it. There was again sharp famine and mortality under William Rufus, not, it would seem, from one or more bad seasons, but because the peasants actually struck work, seeing that the crops they raised were promptly confiscated as tribute to the king. The same groaning under excessive taxes continued under Henry I., whose reign is marked by numerous famine-pestilences and murrains. The anarchy and civil wars of

Disease  
and Famine.

1216]

Stephen's reign were attended by the same calamities ; and it is only on the accession of Henry II. in 1154 that these entries in the annals cease for a time, and, with a single exception, for the whole of his long reign. Good government could not absolutely prevent famine and epidemic sickness, for two bad harvests in succession almost certainly produced them in any country of mediæval Europe. One great famine-pestilence of that kind occurred all over England, in the reign of Richard I., during six months of the year 1196 ; it is the pestilence vaguely referred to in a few words in "Ivanhoe." The harvests had been bad for several years before, not in England only, but all over Europe ; the people had been dying of want, and at length a pestilential fever arose, "as if from the corpses of the famished," says the historian, which crept about everywhere, attacking those who had food as well as those who were in want. William of Newburgh saw it in Yorkshire, and Giraldus Cambrensis tells how the starving people besieged the doors and windows of the hospice in which he was then residing at Lincoln. The mortality must have been on the great scale, for ceremonial burials were omitted except in cases of the rich, and in populous places the dead were buried in trenches, as they were afterwards in the Black Death. Some part of that great mortality had not been due directly to famine. William of Newburgh, whose historical gifts inspire respect for his opinion, is explicit that those also who did not lack bread were infected, as if from the corpses of the famished ; and he tells a strange story, related to him by an eye-witness, of how the village or small town of Annan, on the Solway, was desolated by a plague which was eventually traced to a particular corpse thrown naked into a shallow hole in the ground, and how certain wise men of the place stopped the epidemic by having the offensive body dug up and cremated.

SELDOM has there been a more bloodless conquest of a comparatively civilised country than that of England by the Normans ; nor have we far to seek for the reason. After the battle of Senlac there were no leaders for the English, and, in a very few years, all effectual resistance was at an end ; Edwin and

**Social Life,  
and Manners.**



Morkere being disposed of, even Hereward the Wake having given in his submission, as finding all further opposition hopeless, and Edgar Atheling being of no account. This state of things was partly brought about by the pacific behaviour of the Conqueror—as is well exemplified in William's Charter to the City of London. The alleged original is preserved in the Guildhall, and is written in Anglo-Saxon, a translation of which is as follows:—

**Results of the  
Conquest.**

“William the King greets William the Bishop and Godfrey the Portreeve and all the burgesses that be in London—French and English—friendly. And I make known unto you that it is my will that you enjoy all the laws which you had in the days of King Edward. And I will that every child shall be his father's heir after his father's death. And I will not suffer that any man shall do you any injury. God have you in His keeping.”

There was, besides, no change in religion; and although the English nobility, who did not readily submit, were subjected to confiscation of their estates, and it was also necessary for the safe holding of England that it should be dotted all over with Norman fortresses, the “man of the people” in England suffered but little. He merely changed his master, that was all; and, if William of Malmesbury is to be believed, he changed him for the better.

“Under the Saxons (he says) the Commonalty, left unprotected, became a prey to the most powerful, who amassed fortunes by either seizing on their property, or by selling their persons into foreign countries: although it be an innate quality of this people to be more inclined for revelling than to the accumulation of wealth.”—III., 245.

This practice was finally put down by Henry I. in 1102, who ordained “That there should be no more buying and selling of men used in England, which was hitherto accustomed, as if they had been kine or oxen.”

But no sooner did he feel himself seated firmly on the throne than this mildness of William disappeared. As Speed says:—

“The ancient Lawes of the Land he abrogated for the most part, ordaining new, nothing so equall nor so easie to be kept; which his Lawes, although they merely concerned the *English*, and, therefore, ought of them to have been familiarly knowne, were, notwithstanding, written in the harsh *Norman* tongue, which they understood not; so that many persons, partly by the iniquity of the Law it selfe, partly by ignorance in



1216]

misconstruction, and also by the sleights of Pleaders and Judges, who might pretend for law what they list, were wrongfully condemned, in forfeiture of Goods, Lands, yea, also of Life, and generally so in'angled with their unknowne interpretation, and tortured with their delays, turmoyles, and traverses, that they rather chose to give over their suits than to follow them with their endlesse vexations." \*—*Historie of Great Britain*, Bk. ix., c. 2, § 20.

Naturally he disarmed the people as far as possible, and; in order that there should be no nightly gatherings, he ordained that on the ringing of the curfew-bell at eight o'clock at night all fires and lights should be put out.

He also had an exact survey made of the whole kingdom, of the owners of land, its value, and number of houses and people upon every estate, which is still extant in the Domesday Book, a compilation which is thus metrically described by Robert of Gloucester:—

"The King Willam, vorto wite the wurth of his londe,  
Let enqueri streitliche thoru all Engelonde,  
Hou moni plou-lond, and hou moni hiden al so,  
Were in everich ssire, and wat hii were wurth ther to:  
And the rentes of ech toun, and of the wateres echone,  
Thet worth, and of wodes ek, that ther ne bilevede none,  
That he nuste wat hii were worth of al Engelonde.  
And wite al clene, that worth ther of ich under stonde,  
And let it write clene ynou, and that scrit dude iwis  
In the Tresorie at Westmunstre, there it yut is,  
So that vre Kinges sutthe, wanue hii raunson toke,  
Iredy wat folc mighte give, hii founde there in hor boke."

[7674, seq.

And, having done this, he ordained the payment to himself of six shillings for every hide of land.

When we consider the number of Normans that poured into this land of promise, and were carefully and strategically scattered throughout its length and breadth (for William is believed to have landed in England with at least 60,000 men, 50,000 horse and 10,000 foot), one would imagine that their names would have survived to a much greater extent than they have done. The **Companions of the Conqueror.** record of them, however, is rather meagre, and confined mainly to the Roll of Battle Abbey, which was

\* So it continued till 36 Edward III., c. 15, which enacted that in future all pleas should be pleaded, shown, defended, answered, debated, and judged in the English tongue, but be entered and enrolled in Latin..

supposed to be a list of those chiefs who were present on that fatal day, so that the monks might pray for the souls of those "who, by their labour and valour, had helped to win the kingdom." The original roll has long since disappeared—but even that was not considered trustworthy, for both Dugdale and Camden say that, for a fee, the monks would insert names in it. There are several so-called copies of this roll extant, but the one which gives the greatest number of names is that at the commencement of the third volume of Holinshed's Chronicles, which gives 629 names, against Leland's 495.

That the advent of the Normans produced a vast improvement in manners, morals, and indeed civilisation generally, there can be no doubt. **Social Changes.** William of Malmesbury plainly tells us what society was like at the coming of the Conqueror, and what it was in other reigns:—

"Nevertheless, in process of time, the desire after literature and religion had decayed for several years before the arrival of the Normans. The clergy, contented with a very slight degree of learning, could scarcely stammer out the words of the Sacraments; and a person who understood grammar was an object of wonder and astonishment. The monks mocked the rule of their order by fine vestments and the use of every kind of food. The nobility, given up to luxury and wantonness, went not to church in the morning after the manner of Christians, but merely, in a careless manner; heard matins and masses from a hurrying priest in their chambers, amid the blandishments of their wives. . . . Drinking, in particular, was an universal practice, in which occupation they passed entire nights as well as days. They consumed their whole substance in mean and despicable houses; unlike the Normans and French, who, in noble and splendid mansions, lived with frugality. . . . They were accustomed to eat till they became surfeited, and to drink till they were sick. These latter qualities they imparted to their Conquerors; as to the rest, they adopted their manners. Moreover, the Normans, that I may speak of them also, were, at that time, and are even now, proudly apparelled, delicate in their food, but not excessive. They are a race inured to war, and can hardly live without it; fierce in rushing against the enemy, and, where strength fails of success, ready to use stratagem, or to corrupt by bribery. As I have related, they live in large edifices with economy; envy their superiors, wish to excel their equals, and plunder their subjects, though they defend them from others; they are faithful to their lords, though a slight offence renders them perfidious. They weigh treachery by its chance of success, and change their sentiments with money. They are, however, the kindest of nations, and they esteem strangers worthy of equal honour with themselves. They also intermarry

with their vassals. They revived, by their arrival, the observances of religion, which were everywhere grown lifeless in England. You might see churches rise in every village, and monasteries in the towns and cities, built after a style unknown before; you might behold the country flourishing with renovated rites, so that each wealthy man accounted that day lost to him which he had neglected to signalize by some magnificent action."—III., 245.

This happy state of things did not exist when William Rufus died, as we learn from the same chronicler:—

"The sacred honours of the Church, as the pastors died, were exposed to sale; for, whenever the death of any bishop or abbot was announced, directly one of the king's clerks was admitted, who made an inventory of everything, and carried all future rents into the royal exchequer. In the meantime some person was sought out fit to supply the place of the deceased, not from proof of morals, but of money; and, at last, if I may say so, the empty honour was conferred, and even that purchased at a great price. These things appeared the more disgraceful, because in his father's time, after the decease of a bishop or abbot, all rents were reserved entire, to be given up to the succeeding pastor; and persons truly meritorious on account of their religion were elected. But in the lapse of a very few years everything was changed. There was no man rich except the money changer; no clerk unless he were a lawyer; no priest unless he were a farmer. Men of the meanest condition, or guilty of whatever crime, were listened to, if they could suggest anything likely to be advantageous to the king; the halter was loosened from the robber's neck if he could promise any emolument to the sovereign. All military discipline being relaxed, the courtiers preyed upon the property of the country people, and consumed their substance, taking the very meal from the mouths of these wretched creatures."—IV., 314.

Eadmer, too, speaking of the behaviour of the followers of the Court towards the country people, says:—

"As to their cruelty towards their hosts, or their unseemly conduct towards their wives and daughters, it is shameful even to remember."

This was altered under the reign of Henry I., who

"made a regulation for the followers of his Court, at whichever of his possessions he might be resident, stating what they should accept without payment from the country folks; and how much and at what price they should purchase; punishing the transgressors by a heavy pecuniary fine, or loss of life."—*MS.*, p. 229; *Rolls' Series*, p. 192.

And he set himself to reform as far as possible the effeminacy which prevailed during the preceding reign. According to Ordericus Vitalis, when in Normandy, after hearing a stirring harangue from Serlo, Bishop of Sees, upon

the sinfulness of long hair and beards, he tendered himself to be shorn to the bishop's standard, the prelate himself performing the operation.

After his death things reverted to the old *régime*, and the civil war caused all Henry's good work to be undone.

"There were many castles throughout England, each defending their neighbourhood, but, more properly speaking, laying it waste. The garrisons drove off from the fields both sheep and cattle, nor did they abstain either from churches or church-yards. Seizing such of the country vavassours\* as were reputed to be possessed of money, they compelled them by extreme torture to promise whatever they thought fit. Plundering the houses of the wretched husbandmen, even to their very beds, they cast them into prison; nor did they liberate them but on their giving everything they possessed, or could by any means scrape together for their release. Many calmly expired in the midst of torments inflicted to compel them to ransom themselves, bewailing—which was all they could do—their miseries to God." — *William of Malmesbury*, II., 483.

Such was the general state of the country during the Norman rule. Of the towns and cities other than London we have very little record, even if space allowed. But of London we have a graphic account in its description by William FitzStephen, who most probably wrote it in the reign of Henry II. After mentioning its walls and gates, the Tower, St. Paul's, and the New Palace at Westminster, he says:—

"Adjoining to the buildings all round lie the gardens of those citizens who dwell in the suburbs, which are well furnished with trees, are spacious and beautiful. On the north are cornfields, pastures, and delightful meadows, intermixed with pleasant streams, on which stands many a mill, whose click is so grateful to the ear. Beyond them an immense forest extends itself, beautified with woods and groves, and full of the lairs and coverts of beasts and game, stags, bucks, boars, and wild bulls. The fields above mentioned are by no means hungry gravel or barren sands, but may vie with the fertile plains of Asia, as capable of producing the most luxuriant crops, and filling the barns of the hinds and farmers. Round the city again, and towards the north, arise certain excellent springs at a small distance, whose waters are sweet, salubrious, clear, and

'Whose runnels murmur o'er the shining stones.'

"Amongst these, Holywell, Clerkenwell, and St. Clement's Well may be esteemed the principal, as being much the best frequented, both by scholars from the schools and the youth of the city, when in a summer's evening they are disposed to take an airing.

\* Yeomen.

“In respect of the inhabitants, the city may be proud of its inmates, who are well furnished with arms, and are numerous. In the time of the late war, when King Stephen directed a muster, it turned out of effective men no less than twenty thousand horse, properly accoutred, and sixty thousand foot. The citizens of London everywhere, and throughout the whole kingdom, are esteemed the politest of all others in their manners, their dress, and the elegance and splendour of their tables. Insomuch that whilst the inhabitants of other cities are styled *Citizens*, they are dignified with the names of *Barons*. . . . The followers of the several trades, the vendors of various commodities, and the labourers of every kind, are daily to be found in their proper and distinct places, according to their employments.”—Ed. 1772, p. 25.

He goes into raptures over the “Smooth-field,” where was a market for horses fitted either for knight or squire—how they show them off, and occasionally race them against each other—the plough horses, agricultural implements, swine, oxen, and cows; in fact, Smithfield market was very much the same in those days as it was when done away with in 1855. He speaks of the commerce of the city and of its good government, and his only regrets are, “the excessive drinking of some foolish people, and the frequent fires,” which were owing to the houses being chiefly built of timber, and the very narrow streets. His description of the amusements of the citizens is so good that it must be given *in extenso* :—

“London, in lieu of the ancient shows of the theatre, and the entertainments of the scene, has exhibitions of a more devout kind; either representations of those miracles which were wrought by holy confessors, or those passions and sufferings in which the martyrs so signally displayed their fortitude. Besides—that we may begin with the pastimes of the boys—annually, on the day which is called Shrove Tuesday, the boys of respective schools bring to the masters each one his fighting cock, and they are indulged all the morning with seeing their cocks fight in the school-room. After dinner all the youth of the city go into the field of the suburbs, and address themselves to the famous game of football. The scholars of each school have their peculiar ball; and the particular trades have, most of them, theirs. The elders of the city, the fathers of the parties, and the rich and wealthy, come to the field on horseback, in order to behold the exercises of the youth, and in appearance are themselves as youthful as the youngest; their natural heat seeming to be revived at the sight of so much agility, and in a participation of the diversions of their festive sons. Every Sunday in Lent a noble train of young men take the field, after dinner, well-mounted on horses of the best mettle of which

‘Each steed’s well taught to gallop in a ring.’

“The lay sons of the citizens rush out of the gates in shoals, furnished

with lances and shields; the younger sort with javelins pointed, but disarmed of their steel. They ape the feats of war, and act the sham-fight, practising the antagonistic exercises of that kind. If the king happens to be near the city, many courtiers honour them with their presence, together with the juvenile part of the households of the bishops, earls, and barons, such as are not yet dignified with the honour of knight-hood, and are desirous of trying their skill. The hope of victory excites their emulation. The generous chargers neigh and champ the bit. At length when the course begins, and the youthful combatants are divided into classes or parties, one body retreats and another pursues, without being able to come up with them; whilst in another quarter, the pursuers overtake the foe, unhorse them, and pass them many a length.

“At Easter the diversion is prosecuted on the water; a target is strongly fastened to a trunk or mast fixed in the middle of the river, and a youngster standing upright in the stern of a boat, made to move as fast as the oars and current can carry it, is to strike the target with his lance; and if, in hitting it, he breaks his lance and keeps his place in the boat, he gains his point and triumphs; but if it happens the lance is not shivered by the force of the blow, he is, of course, tumbled into the water, and away goes his vessel without him. However, a couple of boats full of young men are placed one on each side of the target, so as to be ready to take up the unsuccessful adventurer the moment he emerges from the stream and comes fairly to the surface. The bridge and the balconies on the banks are filled with spectators, whose business is to laugh. On holidays, in summer, the pastime of the youth is to exercise themselves in archery, in running, leaping, wrestling, casting of stones, and flinging to certain distances, and, lastly, with bucklers. The maidens, as soon as the moon rises, dance to the guitar, and with their nimble movements shake the ground.

“In the winter holidays the youths are entertained in a morning with boars fighting to the last gasp, as, likewise, with hogs full tusked, intended to be converted into bacon; or game bulls and bears of a large bulk are baited with dogs. And when that vast lake which waters the walls of the City towards the north\* is hard frozen, the youth, in great numbers, go to divert themselves on the ice. Some, taking a small run for an increment of velocity, place their feet at the proper distance, and are carried, sliding sideways, a great way; others will make a large cake of ice, and seating one of their companions upon it, they take hold of one another's hands, and draw him along: when it sometimes happens that, moving so swiftly on so slippery a plain, they all fall down headlong. Others there are who are still more expert in these amusements on the ice; they place certain bones, the leg bones of some animal, under the soles of their feet by tying them round their ancles, and, then, taking a pole shod with iron into their hands, they push themselves forward by striking it against the ice, and are carried along with a velocity equal to the flight of a bird, or a bolt discharged from a cross-bow. Sometimes two of them thus furnished agree to start opposite one to another, at a great distance;

\* The fenny districts of Moorfields, Finsbury, etc.

1216]

they meet, elevate their poles, attack and strike each other, when one or both of them fall, and not without some bodily hurt; and even after their fall they shall be carried a good distance from each other by the rapidity of the motion; and whatever part of your head comes upon the ice, it is sure to be laid bare to the skull. Very often the leg or the arm of the party that falls, if he chanceth to light upon them, is broken; but youth is an age ambitious of glory, fond and covetous of victory, and that in future time it may acquit itself boldly and valiantly in real engagements, it will run these hazards in sham ones. Many of the citizens take great delight in fowling, with merlins, hawks, etc.; as, likewise, in hunting; and they have a right and privilege of hunting in Middlesex, Hertfordshire, in all the Chiltern country, and in Kent as far as the river Cray" (p. 45).

This shows the importance of the citizens of London at that time, for both hawking and hunting were sports only for persons of quality, and woe be to the unhappy wight of the lower orders who indulged either in hunting or hawking; he would be, if caught, severely punished, and might have his eyes put out; even a dog caught trespassing had a fore-foot cut off. The troubles of the times, however, caused many a man to live in the huge forests which then existed in England, where, although he was without the pale of the law, he could subsist on the game and whatever plunder came in his way; and hence we have the legends of the bold doings of the mythical Robin Hood and his merry men. William I. made the New Forest in Hampshire by "desolating the towns and destroying the churches for more than thirty miles," and William II. "so restricted the right of hunting, which he formerly allowed, that it became a capital offence to take a stag."

But although the youth of London had their season of play—yet they had to go to school. There were three schools in London, attached, of **Education.** course, to three churches—the Cathedral of St. Paul, St. Mary-le-Bow, and St. Martin-le-Grand; as also that attached to the Abbey of Westminster. And, according to Fitz Stephen, they must have been made to work.

"On festivals, at those churches where the Feast of the Patron Saint is solemnised, the masters convene their scholars. The youth on that occasion dispute, some in the demonstrative way, and some logically. These produce their enthymemes, and those the more perfect syllogisms. Some, the better to shew their parts, are exercised in disputation, contending with one another, whilst others are put upon establishing some



truth by way of illustration. Some sophists endeavoured to apply, on feigned topics, a vast heap and flow of words; others to impose upon you with false conclusions. As to the orators, some with their rhetorical harangues employ all the powers of persuasion, taking care to observe the precepts of art, and to omit nothing apposite to the subject. The boys of different schools wrangle with one another in verse; contending about the principles of grammar, or the rules of the Perfect tenses and the Supines. Others there are who, in Epigrams, or other compositions in numbers, use all that low ribaldry we read of in the Ancients; attacking their school-masters, but without mentioning names, with the old Fescennine licentiousness, discharging their scoffs and sarcasms against them, touching the foibles of their schoolfellows, or perhaps of greater personages, with their Socratic wit" (p. 30).

Though there is little to be said, from the æsthetic point of view, of any art but that of architecture (which is dealt with elsewhere) during this period, there are certain forms of art-work wherein we find graphic representations of manners and customs, dress and furniture, which are of the greatest importance to the student. Thus from the Bayeux Tapestry—which is said to have been the work of Matilda, the wife of William, and which is undoubtedly contemporary—we get details of life among both Saxon and Norman which no writing could have typified. Rough though the execution of this tapestry is, we feel that it is faithful, and value it accordingly, although perspective and light and shade are utterly ignored.

Another branch of art in which both colour and drawing the figure were employed was enamel, of which the Normans were very fond. We find numerous examples of it—both *champlevée* and *cloisonnée*; and it enriched all kinds of church metal-work, pastoral staves, pyxes, candlesticks, shrines and reliquaries, etc.; and it was used for domestic purposes in jewellery, buttons, hilts of swords, book-covers, etc. English embroidery was highly prized, and was very good. In accordance with the feelings of the times the Church naturally had the best, and the mitre and robes of Thomas à Becket, preserved at Sens, are beautiful examples of embroidery of this period.

Many sculptured figures too, remain to us, which are invaluable as giving more accurate details of costume than could be gleaned from the illuminations in books, which are not altogether trustworthy. For instance, in MSS.

of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries we constantly meet with representations of houses, castles, churches, abbeys, etc., which are as unlike the originals as they could well be made, and which would be impossible to reproduce in stone or any other material. Luckily, however, we have so many remains of Norman architecture still existing in England that we know exactly how they built, and can trace every gradation in the art. The numerous fortresses scattered all over the country tell us, even if they are in ruins, how the nobles were housed. Numerous churches and abbeys remain to attest the solidity and beauty of workmanship; and the cathedrals of Canterbury, Carlisle, Chester, Chichester, St. David's, Durham, Ely, Exeter, Gloucester, Llandaff, Lincoln, Norwich, Oxford, Peterborough, Rochester, Winchester, and Worcester, all bear traces of Norman work between 1066 and 1216. The burghers lived in houses made either of stone or wood, but the villan had a mud, or wattle and daub hut, generally thatched with reeds.

Of the number of castles in existence we may get some idea by the fact that one of the articles of agreement at the Conference held in Winchester in 1153 settled—

“That all those Castells which, contrarie to all reason and good order, had beene made and builded by any maner of person in the daies of King Stephau, should be overthrown and cast downe, which were found to be eleven hundred and fifteen.”—Holinshed, *op. cit.* II., 61 b. 17.

This, however, was not enforced until 1155, in the second year of Henry II. But against this destruction we must put the fact that more abbeys were erected in Stephen's reign than in the previous hundred years. A castle was generally surrounded by a moat, and, if rising ground could be found, there it was surely situated. If moated, the only entrance was by a draw-bridge, which at night and in times of danger was always up, the warder thereof occupying an apartment which commanded a good look-out over the surrounding country, and it was his duty to interrogate through a wicket any visitor, and to give him admittance if desirable. The plan of all castles was very similar. On entering the gateway, there was a courtyard, whose sides were formed by the hall, the chapel, the stables, and offices. The great feature was the hall. It was *the* room of the house. Into it were

Domestic Life.

ushered all visitors, and here the host received them. Here meals were taken in common, the difference in rank being marked by a large salt-cellar upon the table—above the salt being appropriated to the lord, his family and guests; below, all those of meaner degree; and after supper it was the sleeping-place of the latter, on beds of straw, with the dogs, who were numerous, and who used to be fed at the family meals. There was in later times a minstrels' gallery at one end, and the walls were decorated with antlers and other trophies of the chase, and arms which were for use, not ornament. The lower part was almost always hung with tapestry, or cloth hangings, and huge fires warmed this principal apartment. When attached to a palace, we can form a conception of the size by Westminster Hall, which was originally built by William Rufus, who, on its being suggested that it was too large for its purpose, said, "The hall is not big enough by one-half, and is but a bed-chamber to that which I have a mind to make." There was but seldom any communication from the hall to the upper part of the house or "solar," where were the bed-chambers and the "lady's bower," or private apartment, this floor being reached by means of an outside staircase in the courtyard. The principal windows were fairly large, sometimes—not always—glazed, and barred with iron. All else was lit by means of narrow slits in the masonry, loopholes through which no one could enter but which were very useful for defence. There were cellars for provisions, and perhaps a dungeon or two for prisoners, and, of course, a well was of paramount importance. Judged by our standard, they must have been most uncomfortable dwelling-places. The smaller houses of the burghers were much snugger and more comfortable, but even in these the staircase to the "solar" was generally outside.

Titles of nobility were then, as now, hereditary, while knighthood was for the most part the reward of valour; a knight-banneret being the title most coveted, as it was awarded on the field for some special feat. The nobility, as well as the king, had the power of making knights; but in the early days after the Conquest the higher clergy could confer this honour—Archbishop Lanfranc having knighted William Rufus, and, according to legend, Hereward was made knight by his uncle Brand, Abbot of Peterborough: but this power was taken from

1216]

them by Henry I. These knights had personal attendants, mostly of gentle blood, who had to clean and bear their master's armour, spare lances, etc., groom his horses, and perform all sorts of menial offices for him, which were not thought derogatory, but as fitting them for the position they all coveted and aspired to—that of knighthood. This, naturally, created a large number of poor knights, who, not being possessed of land, were compelled to attach themselves to one of the more powerful and richer nobility, who, in return for their personal service, clothed, housed, and fed them. The higher nobility did not always reside on their estates—they followed the Court; and many of them had residences in London, near the Tower, which was the royal palace: and Fitz Stephen says that—

“Almost all the bishops, abbots, and great men of this kingdom, are, in a manner, citizens and inhabitants of London, as having their respective, and not inelegant, habitations to which they resort, and where their disbursements and expenses are not sparing, whenever they are summoned thither from the country to attend councils and solemn meetings, by the king or their metropolitan; or are compelled to repair thither for the prosecution of their own proper business.”—*Op. cit.*, p. 43.

Under the Normans the Church waxed mighty. We have seen William of Malmesbury's account of the state of the Saxon Church at the time of the Conquest, how it was sunk in lethargy; but a new state of things was inaugurated with the advent of the Norman, with his holy banner blessed by the Pope himself. The pious Norman fully believed that by endowing the Church he was laying up everlasting salvation. The monkish chronicler says elsewhere:—

The Church.

“King William kindly admitted foreigners to his friendship; bestowed honours on them without distinction, and was attentive to almsgiving; he gave many possessions in England to foreign churches, and scarcely did his own munificence, or that of his nobility, leave any monastery unnoticed, more especially in Normandy, so that their poverty was mitigated by the riches of England. Thus, in his time, the monastic flock increased on every side; monasteries arose, ancient in their rule, but modern in building; but here I perceive the muttering of those who say, it would have been better that the old should have been preserved in their original state than that new ones should have been erected from their plunder.”—III., 278.

In the reign of William Rufus, as the Saxon bishops and abbots died out, they were replaced by Normans; and the

Church grew apace—in fact, it grew so powerful that it sought to make the king merely a vassal of Rome; and it gave much trouble to the temporal power in the succeeding reigns. Many of the bishops, from Odo of Bayeux, downwards, were decidedly of the Church Militant, and they also ranked as temporal barons; this survives in the rule by which bishops sit in the House of Lords; and it is well within living memory that the Bishop of Durham was girt with a sword, as a Prince Palatine. As an instance of the state some of them kept up, Holinshed says of William Longchampe, Lord Chancellor and Bishop of Ely in the reign of Richard I. :—

“He maintained such a post and countenance in his doings, that he would ride with a thousand horses, by meanes whereof, when he came to lie at abbeis, and other places (bringing with him such a train), he was very burdenous to them, specially when he laie at their houses any space of time.”—Holinshed, ed. 1586, III., p. 1290, line 17.

Very many of the Saxon priests were married; and the  
**Clerical Celibacy.** Conquest, bringing with it a foreign priest-hood much more under the influence of Rome than was that of England, the attention of the Pope was called to the fact. They were told they must put away their wives; but, as they paid no attention to the command, Pope Gregory VII., in 1077, published a Bull, ordaining that none should hear mass performed by a married priest. Moreover, they were fined; and in 1099, Ranulph, Bishop of Chichester, and William Rufus had a quarrel as to who should have these fines, which ended in the bishop gaining the day. But, the priests loyally cleaving to their wives, further measures had to be taken; so in 1108, Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, held a synod, whereat, in presence of the king, and with the assent of the earls and barons of the realm, it was enacted that no priest, deacon, or subdeacon should thereafter enter into matrimony, and that those who were already married should put away their wives, and meet them only in the presence of witnesses and in public places. Disobedience was punished according to its degree by deprivation or excommunication. This seems to have had the desired effect; and the priesthood afterwards were greatly favoured, for in 1142,

“Because the bishops shewed themselves verie liberall towards the advancing of the King’s purpose, there was a statute made at the same

parlement, that whosoever did laie anye violent hands on a sacred person, or else took upon him to apprehend any of them, for what fault soever, without the bishop's license, he should be accursed, and not assoiled of any maner of person, except of the pope, as by a canon it was already decreed, but not obeied among the Englishmen till that daie. The cause of making this statute was chieflie for that the preests during the time of the civill wars were dailie either slaine or taken prisoners, and so put to their ransoms, or charged with great penalties and greevous fines."—*Holinshed*, ed. 1586, III., p. 54, b. 42.

We have seen how the number of monasteries increased after the Conquest, and the people had much reason to be thankful therefor: they were Monastic Life. centres for learning, and the monks were essentially the friends of the poor, relieving their distresses and healing their sicknesses—nay, even going among the lepers, who were very numerous—the very incarnation of self-abnegation. The monasteries themselves were as inns to the wayfarer, none being refused food or lodging, be his quality what it might. Some waxed fat and luxurious, but not all; and in some few cases the Conquest brought dissension into the monastery, as in the following case, *temp.* 1084:—

"It hapned about the same time, that when King William had finished the rating of his subjects, that there rose a strife betwixt Thurstane, abbat of Glastenbarie, a Norman, and the monkes of that house. One cause thereof was, for that the abbat would have compelled them to have left the plaine song, or note, for the service which Pope Gregorie had set foorth, and to have used an other kind of tune devised by one William of Fescampe; besides this, the said abbat spent and wasted the goods that belonged to the house, in riot, leacherie, and by such other insolent meanes (withdrawing also from the monkes their old accustomed allowance of diet), for the which they first fell at altercation in words, and, afterwards, to fighting. The abbat got armed men about him, and falling upon the monkes, slue three of them at the high altar, and wounded xvij. Howbeit, the monkes for their parts plaid the pretie men, with formes and candlesticks, defending themselves as well as they might, so that they hurt divers of the abbat's adherents, and drove them out of the quier."—*Ib.*, II., 13 b., 30 sq. [*Cf.*, however, p. 252, *ante*, which gives an earlier episode in the fight].

England had its share in that special religious movement of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, the Crusades; and though we are not here concerned with the history of this movement, the intercourse with other nations which it engendered laid the foundation of the commerce of England, and thus materially influenced our social progress.



The intimate relations between England and Normandy, which by conquest became much enlarged, **Commerce.** naturally encouraged commerce between the Continent and England, and London rapidly became its centre, ships coming thither from Flanders, Germany, Gascony, Italy, and from Norway. Wharves lined the sides of the Thames, and each class of goods was landed at a wharf set apart either for it or its nationality. The vessels, if we could judge by the Bayeux Tapestry—but that, as has been before remarked, is hardly a trustworthy authority on nautical matters—were opposed to all our notions of shipbuilding. Still, they were apparently much more seaworthy than those of the next two centuries. They were sailing-vessels, but undecked, and when filled with men, their kite-like shields were all ranged along the side, like the “war-boards” of their ancestors. They were rounded at stem and stern, one or both of which was sometimes carved like a lion’s or dragon’s head. They were steered by an oar at the stern, and were of sufficient capacity to carry many horses, one being shown as containing ten. In the succeeding centuries they varied in form, having both stem and stern considerably raised, the vessel being decked and having a poop at the stern and a raised platform at the stem. They generally had a crow’s-nest up the mast for a look-out, and floated high out of the water. Many representations of ships of these centuries may be found in contemporary manuscripts and also (of the thirteenth century) in the seals of Dover, Yarmouth, Sandwich, Poole, and probably of some other English towns. How they successfully performed the voyages they did is a marvel to us. Some of the war-vessels (*dromonds*, sometimes loosely called *busses*) were large and had three masts, and they were attended by galleys, which were propelled by oars, and by transport vessels.

The twelfth and thirteenth centuries were notable for their Gilds or voluntary associations of merchants or traders, which insured order and mutual protection of their members, and which, although they existed in a rudimentary form in Saxon times, grew to be mighty institutions in these two hundred years, and by their honesty and integrity of dealing made the name of the English merchant respected throughout the civilised world. Many of the trades had



their Gild—now surviving in the livery companies of London—which protected and fostered their particular branch of trade, controlling prices, and seeing that the goods and workmanship were of good quality. Two of the livery companies of London still are living Gilds in this sense. One, the Goldsmiths', assays gold; the other, the Gunmakers', proves the trustworthiness of gun-barrels; and both affix their stamp to show the article has been assayed and approved. Commerce was the only road open to the capitalist to increase his wealth. It was not to be done by agriculture, for farming was in a deplorably backward condition, and there were no manufactures as we know them. Usury was left to the Jews, and this did not profit them much, for when they were ripe they were squeezed both by baron and king.\* They were the money-changers, and, as commerce increased, the inconvenience of remitting so much specie abroad led to the introduction of letters of credit and bills of exchange, the former certainly having been used by King John. The native coinage up to Edward I. was very rude, and consisted only of silver pennies, which should have weighed  $22\frac{1}{2}$  grains each, but this they seldom did. Base coin was undoubtedly made, especially in the reign of Stephen, although none are now known to exist; but Henry II. on his accession to the throne found the coinage in a bad state from adulteration and clipping, and a new issue was made about 1156, when the base coins called *Basels* were called in.

\*The Jews were terribly persecuted, and wherever they might dwell they were compelled to bury their dead in London. But in 1177 Henry II. abolished this regulation. At the Coronation of Richard I. they went to present him with a rich gift, but they were prevented entering the palace gates, were set upon, beaten and stoned, driven back to their houses, some of which were set on fire and the Jews therein burnt. After this the king commanded that no man should do them hurt, but the very next year the poor Jews at Lynn in Norfolk were beaten and robbed most pitifully. In King John's time—1210—the Jews were specially taxed, and one of them, at Bristol, would not pay the 10,000 marks at which he was assessed, so by the king's command he had a tooth wrenched out every day until he complied. "By the space of seaven daies together he stood stedfast, loosing everie of those daies a tooth, but, on the eighth day, when he shuld come to have the eight tooth and the last (for he had but eight in all) drawne out, he paid the money to save that one."—[*Holinshed*, ed. 1586, II., 174, a. 40.] In 1256 one hundred and two Jews were brought from Lincoln to Westminster, charged with having crucified a Christian child. Eighteen of these were hanged, and the remainder lay long in prison.

In the reign of Richard I. (1197) it was ordained that measures of all kind of grain should be the same throughout the realm, as also the weights, and one kind of yard; but errors must have crept in, for it was found necessary in the twelfth year of Henry III.'s reign to reform the weights and measures to one standard.

#### AUTHORITIES.—1066-1216.

##### GENERAL HISTORY.

1066-1154.—The story of the Norman conquest as it appeared immediately afterwards is told by William of Jumièges, by William of Poitiers (the Conqueror's chaplain) in the *Carmen de Bello Hastingsi*, and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, but best (for those who can read between the lines) in Domesday Book. For the reigns of William II. and Henry I. the Chronicle must be supplemented by Eadmer's works, and by those of the monk Ordericus Vitalis. From this last writer, with the *Gesta Stephani*, William of Malmesbury (Rolls Series), the Hexham annalists, and the *Chronicle of Melrose*, we derive our account of Stephen's reign. The best modern account (to 1135) is Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, vols. iv. and v. (summed up in his *Short History of the Norman Conquest*). Stubbs' *Constitutional History*, from chap. ix., is invaluable. Dean Church's *Anselm* is an excellent biography. The facts and details are given fully in Franck Bright's *History of England*; Green's *Short History of the English People* supplies a brilliant sketch. The best summary is Stubbs' *Early Plantagenets* (beginning with Henry I.).

1154-1216.—Of a crowd of contemporary writers on Henry II.'s reign, William of Newburgh, the so-called Benedict of Peterborough, and Roger Hoveden, give the best narratives. Ralph de Diceto may be added, while Giraldus Cambrensis, John of Salisbury, and the Rolls Series (collections of matters relating to Becket) are supplementary. For the reigns of Richard and John most of these writers are the primary authorities. These reigns are also illustrated by the memorials of Richard I. (Rolls Series), the various monastic annals, and the collection of Royal Rolls, and the selected documents in Stubbs' *Charters*. Modern writers as before; a fuller treatment may be found in Miss Norgate's *England under the Angevin Kings*.

*Domesday Book*.—The text of the *Survey*, with that of the *Exon Domesday*, *Inquisitio Eliensis*, *Winton Domesday*, is in most public libraries. Facsimiles (obtainable separately for each county) are published by the Government. Sir H. Ellis's *Introduction to Domesday Book*, with indices (2 vols., 1833), is very useful; R. W. Eyton, *Domesday Studies* (analysis and digest of the Staffordshire survey), 1881; also *Dorset Survey* and *Key to Domesday*. Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, vol. v., is very useful and suggestive. [J. L. C. Mowat] *Notes on Oxfordshire Domesday*, 1892 (a good model for Domesday students). J. H. Round, *Domesday Studies* (in *Domesday Celebration* volumes), the best modern investigations on difficult points. The *Testa de Nerill* and *Hundred Rolls* and the *Domesday Book of St. Paul's* (published by the Dean and Chapter) are necessary for comparison of Domesday with later arrangements. Seebohm, *English Village Community*, excellent on open-field cultivation. See also Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i.

##### SPECIAL SUBJECTS.

*Religion*.—The leading contemporary authorities besides those above cited are the works of Eadmer, Walter of Mapes (Camden Society), Giraldus Cambrensis,

[1216]

Lanfranc, and Anselm (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*); the Lives of St. Thomas of Canterbury, his letters, and those of Gilbert Foliot (Migne), and Walter of Coventry. When not otherwise specified the above works are in the Rolls Series. A selection from the authorities as to Becket is given in English, in W. H. Hutton's *St. Thomas of Canterbury* (D. Nutt, 1889).

*Law.*—Stubbs' *Select Charters* is indispensable, as also Bigelow's *Placita Anglo-Normannica*, and the various records published by the Record Commission and the Pipe Roll Society. The law books of the period are mostly printed in Schmidt, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*. Dr. Liebermann is re-editing them, and has published the *Quadripartitus* and the *Conciliatio Cnuti*. Glanvill's text-book has often been published. The *Dialogus de Scaccario* is in Stubbs' *Select Charters*. Various scattered publications of Dr. Heinrich Brunner (esp. *Die Entstehung der Schwurgerichte*) and of Dr. Liebermann are of great value.

*Warfare.*—The evidence is scattered throughout the ancient chronicles, especially Froissart. Modern books—Hewitt, *Ancient Armour*, Oxford, 1860; G. T. Clarke, *Mediæval Military Architecture*, 2 vols., 1886; and Oman, *Art of War in the Middle Ages*.

*Naval Matters* (1066-1399).—Here also the evidence is very much scattered. In particular, besides the *Chronicles*, the *Black Book of the Admiralty*, the *Pipe Rolls*, *Close Rolls*, *Patent Rolls*, and *Rolls of Parliament*, the *Wardrobe Accounts*, the *Acta Regia*, the *Chronicle of Flodoard*, and of Melrose, and the *Chronique de Normandie* may be mentioned, as also Selden's *Mare Clausum*, and Prynne's *Animadversions*, and Bracton. Jal's *Archéologie Navale* is a useful modern authority.

*Trade and Industry.*—Allusions in William of Malmesbury, *Domesday Book*, and the lesser *Domesdays* (e.g., St. Paul's), the *Boldon Book*, the *Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakeland*, and the town charters and other documents in Stubbs' *Select Charters*. The most useful modern books are: Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, vol. v.; Green, *Short History of the English People*; Gross, *Gild Merchant*; Ashley, *Economic History*; Cunningham, *British Industry and Commerce*.

*Architecture.*—Freeman, *History of the Norman Conquest*; Ferguson, *History of Architecture*; Rickman, *Gothic Architecture*; Parker, *Glossary, and Introduction to Gothic Architecture*; Murray's *Cathedral Handbooks*; Scott, *Mediæval Architecture*; Turner and Parker, *Domestic Architecture of the Middle Ages*; Clark, *Mediæval Military Architecture in England*; Winston, *Inquiry into the Difference of Style in Ancient Glass Paintings*. Coins, same as for chap. ii.

*Learning and Science.*—Hampden, *Scholastic Philosophy in its relation to Christian Theology* (1833); Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*; Church, *Anselm*; Bass Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*; R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought*, 1884; H. C. Maxwell-Lyte, *History of the University of Oxford*, 1886; Stubbs' *Literature and Learning at the Court of Henry II.* (in *Seventeen Lectures*, vi., vii.); Rashdall, *The Origins of the University of Paris* (*English Historical Review*, i., 1886); *Early History of Oxford* (*Church Quarterly*, xiii., 1887, and *Academy*, June, 1888); Prof. Holland, *Origin of the University of Oxford* (*English Historical Review*, vi., 1891); Poole, *John of Salisbury*, in *Dictionary of National Biography*, xxix.

*Literature.*—Freeman, *Norman Conquest*; H. Merley, *English Writers*, iii., etc.; Earle's and Plummer's editions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*; Gardiner and Mullinger, *Introduction to the Study of English History*, London, 1882; A. Chevalier, *Répertoire des Sources Historiques du Moyen Age* (Paris, 1877-1886); Nutt, A., *Studies on the Holy Grail* (Folk-lore Society, 1888); The publications in the Rolls Series, especially those edited by Dr. Stubbs. Of a specialist character are B. Ten Brink, *Geschichte der Englischen Litteratur*, i., Berlin, 1877; R. Wuelcker, *Grundriss zur Geschichte der Angelsächsischen Litteratur*, Leipzig, 1885; Ebert, A., *Allgemeine Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters im Abendlande*, Leipzig, 1874-80; and A. Brandl, *Mittelenglische Litteratur* (in Paul's *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*, Strassburg, 1889, etc., ii. 1). The majority of the texts referred to in this and the following chapters have been edited by the Early English Text Society.

A number have also been published by the Surtees and Camden Societies and the Roxburgh Club.

*Social Life.*—Besides the chroniclers above referred to, reference may be made to Holinshed's *Chronicle* (London, 1577, folio); Speed, *Historic of Great Britaine*, etc. (London, 1632, folio); Fitzstephen's *Description of London* (edition of 1772); the Duchess of Cleveland's edition of the *Roll of Battle Abbey* (London, 1889); J. C. Bruce, *The Bayeux Tapestry Elucidated*, London, 1856; P. Lacroix, *Arts in the Middle Ages* (London, 1886); *Manners, Customs, and Dress during the Middle Ages* (London, 1874); C. Walford, *Origin of Gilds*; H. O. Wakeman, *Essays on Anglo-Norman Administrative System*, 1887; T. Wright, *The Homes of Other Days*, 1881; and H. Hall, *History of Customs Revenue in England*, 1885. The English illustrated MSS. in the British Museum afford, of course, most valuable evidence.

## CHAPTER IV.

FROM CHARTER TO PARLIAMENT.—1216–1273.

SIXTEEN years of troubled and factious, but eventually successful, government; seventeen tedious years of attempted absolutism and abortive efforts at resistance to it; seven critical years of civil war, baronial triumphs, quarrels, and failures; finally, eight uneventful years of peace and comparative good government: such is the varied story of the long confused reign of Henry III. (1216–1273). John's death left the kingdom in an alarming condition. Two foreign bands were quartered on the country—John's mercenaries and Louis's troops; and to Louis's cause nearly all the barons were bound by oaths. Langton was absent in disgrace, and a Papal Legate held the English Church in his grasp. The Justiciar was Peter des Roches, Bishop of Winchester, a Poitevin, and thoroughly foreign in his views. There was a strong feudal party ready to seize any opportunity of disorder. But John's death had also removed the one exciting cause of all these troubles. A coalition was at once made between the English ministers and the foreign, the feudal party and the papal. Within three weeks the young king had been crowned (he was nine years old); the Charter had been reissued, and William the Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, made guardian and regent. In the spring of 1217 the barons were fast returning to their allegiance. On May 20th the battle called the Fair of Lincoln reduced Louis to take refuge in London; and the defeat of his fleet by Hubert de Burgh made him submit to the inevitable. By Michaelmas, 1217, England was at peace. But to restore order was a longer task. Barons like Ranulf of Chester had fought against a French prince, chiefly to secure a monopoly of power to themselves. Foreign adventurers like Fawkes de Breauté, the evil legacy of John, still held themselves entrenched in English offices; sheriff of six

A. L. SMITH.  
The Reign of  
Henry III.,  
1216–1273.

counties, captain of a band of ruffians, abductor of heiresses, and intimidator of justice, "he was more than a king in England," says the Dunstable annalist. But before the Marshall died in 1219 much had been done. Much, too, was

**Hubert de Burgh.**

done after him by Hubert de Burgh, who as Justiciar was joined in power with Pandulf, the new Legate, and Peter des Roches, now guardian of the king's person, but to whose sole credit is due the work achieved between 1219 and 1227. This meant the extirpation of such pests as Fawkes de Breauté, the vindication of royal authority over the feudal castles, and the restoration of Langton to the chief control of the English Church. In 1227 the king declared himself of age, but, fortunately for himself, not till 1232 was he strong enough to shake off Hubert, the great Justiciar, who stood between the king and the contempt and resentment of his subjects, and who checked the king's foolish schemes of Welsh, Scotch, and French wars. Hubert fell by a combination of hostile forces—the feudal party's vengeance, the intrigues of rivals, the papal influence, and Henry's own vanity and self-will. But the gratitude which the country owed him is typified in the story of the blacksmith who refused to forge irons for the man who had saved England. With Peter des Roches' return to office and Henry's marriage to Eleanor of Provence, Hubert's policy of England for the English was reversed, and "swarms of hungry bandits, horsed and armed" (in the vigorous words of Matthew Paris), trooped down upon the land and displaced the English ministers and officials. The barons met and threatened to depose the king if he did not dismiss Bishop Peter.

**Fall of Bishop Peter.**

The bishop fell in 1234, but not before he had betrayed the baronial leader, Richard the Marshall, to his death, and initiated the king in a policy of personal government which caused the kingdom thirty-three years of misrule and strife, and nearly cost the king his throne. This policy, following on the memories of John's mercenaries, generated that hatred of foreign influences which is a keynote of English feeling from this time to the Tudors.

The outcry against "aliens" sometimes seems exaggerated.

**The Aliens.**

But it must be remembered that besides supplanting the English nobles and impoverishing the Crown, they encouraged the kings to aim at

1273]

absolutism. Their hold on castles and seaports was a great danger; they menaced the new-created unity of England, and were a part of that oppressive system by which the wealth and welfare of the English Church was drained away to support foreign prelates. The Primacy itself was held by Boniface of Savoy, the queen's uncle; her two brothers were earls. In 1252 Bishop Grosseteste of Lincoln, the foremost Churchman of his day, declared that papal nominees drew yearly from England moneys to thrice the amount of the royal revenues. Henry's weak and impressionable mind was overawed by the masterful character of a Gregory IX. and an Innocent IV. When the Popes demanded tithe from the English clergy, "the king became a reed to lean on"; and such exactions became almost annual. But baronial and ecclesiastical discontent could effect nothing without a leader. First Richard of Cornwall, the king's brother, next Richard Marshall, then Edmund Rich the Primate, and the famous Grosseteste, successively headed movements against Henry's wanton wastefulness, and his perpetual violations of the charters, the anarchy due to continued abeyance of the offices of Chancellor, Justiciar, and Treasurer, and the repeated gross breaches of faith on the king's part. He had once sworn "as a man, a Christian, a knight, a crowned and anointed king"; but this too he broke as lightly as he did the rest.

Matters had seemed to be coming to a climax many times—in 1233, 1237, 1242, 1244. At this date Richard of Cornwall again stood forth to head the demands for reform, which became more urgent in 1248, 1253, and 1255.

But it was a conjunction of peculiar incidents **The Barons' War.** which produced at last the right man in Simon de Montfort. A foreigner by birth, but heir to the earldom of Leicester, he had won the king's favour and married his sister, and had served him well in the thankless lieutenancy of Gascony, only to experience Henry's ingratitude and suspicion. Simon had shown his sympathy with the reforming party as early as 1244; but not till 1254 was he much in England. The king had in 1255 been lured into supporting the implacable papal war with the Hohenstaufen, though these princes were Henry's own kin by marriage. By conferring the title of "King of Sicily" on the vain king's second son Edmund, a



mere child, the Pope gained the riches of England to draw upon, and had soon run up against Henry a bill of 140,000 marks. The king coolly asked the clergy for such a sum. "The ears of all tingled," says Matthew Paris, but they had to promise 52,000 marks. When next year the barons found that the king had pledged the country's honour for the whole debt, three times the annual revenue of England, they felt the cup was full. They had come armed to Oxford; the royalists called it the Mad Parliament.

But the Provisions of Oxford, though they banished the aliens, chose the ministers, and practically superseded the royal power by baronial committees, were temperate enough, if somewhat cumbrous, in their scheme of reform. The king could only govern through a council of fifteen, composed of royalists and barons alike; thrice a year this council was to meet twelve leading men elected from the whole baronage. This joint body was called a "Parliament"; and the twelve were said to "represent the whole community." Such an oligarchical scheme of reform was foredoomed to failure. Perhaps Henry foresaw this when, to get his debt paid, he swore to the Provisions. If so, he was right; for, in a little more than a year, the excluded elements asserted themselves. Backed by Prince Edward, and probably encouraged by Simon de Montfort, "the body of the knighthood of England" attacked the baronial government for their self-seeking and exclusiveness, and extorted from them a further set of reforms. When the two great earls who had led the movement quarrelled, Simon represented the liberal, Gloucester the oligarchical party. The political advance of the former party, knights, freeholders, and burgesses, is what gives the chief meaning and interest to the turbulent, shifting, and seemingly futile story of these years of strife (1258-65). Twice over were the quarrelling barons frightened into reunion by their enemies' recovery of strength. For in 1261 Henry had got easy absolution by Papal Bull from all his oaths; and in November, 1262, Prince Edward, probably suspicious of Earl Simon's designs, had rejoined his father's side. On the other hand, in 1262, the old Earl of Gloucester died, and his son was a firm reformer. At last, after incessant wranglings and intrigues, sheer weariness forced both sides to submit the whole situation to the

1273]

arbitrament of King Louis of France. His award naturally was adverse to the insurgent cause. But Simon fell back on the Provisions of Magna Carta, and the Londoners refused to accept an arbitration to which they had been no parties. The balance of military strength was now against him. He was driven into alliance with the rebel Welsh, and when at last it came to a pitched battle at Lewes, he was so overmatched by the king's forces that his less disciplined troops must have been defeated .

The Battle of  
Lewes.

but for Prince Edward's making just the same mistake as Prince Rupert did in 1645 at Naseby. For Simon's party, the towns, the clergy, and the lower people, could not balance the fighting force of the barons, most of whom were now royalist. With vindictive fury Edward charged, broke, and scattered the Londoners, and pursued them for miles, to find on his return that all was over—his father, uncle, and cousin prisoners, and the Earl of Leicester the real ruler of England.

But victory gave Simon a position little less untenable. Under a thin veil of the king's name England was ruled for fourteen months by a council of nine, appointed by three men; and the three were Simon himself, his admirer, the young Clare, Earl of Gloucester, and his friend the Bishop of Chichester. But Simon's sons, with unpardonable folly, offended the Clares, allowed Prince Edward to escape by a very simple trick, were surprised by him, and so enabled him to outmanœuvre their father. "Sir Simon the righteous" fell at Evesham, and, with a ferocity rare in English warfare, his body was hideously mutilated. But his memory lived among the people; for generations he was worshipped as a saint; at his tomb miraculous cures were effected. He was indeed a great man; and yet before he died the work which he could do was done, and that which was still to do remained for his greater successor, his pupil, ally, and enemy, Edward I. With the royalist victory, and the final submission of the residue of the malcontents to the Award of Kenilworth fifteen months later, the interest of the reign closes. When most of the Provisions of Westminster were, in 1267, drawn up as statutes in the Marlborough Parliament, much of what the barons had fought for was achieved. In 1270 Prince Edward started on a crusade; and while he lay

wounded by the fanatic's dagger at Acre, Henry III. had died, proclamation of the peace had been made in the name of Edward I., and the oaths of fealty to his person had been taken.

THE origin of the English Parliament is to be traced back to the local institutions of the Germanic tribes. But the final stages of its growth are to be sought in the period between the accession of Henry II. and the close of Edward I.'s reign.

**A. L. SMITH.**  
**The Genesis of**  
**Parliament.**

Up to the year 1213 its history is a history of the measures by which the Royal power was drilling the local institutions to co-operate in carrying out locally the work of administration. From 1213 the scene changes, as it were, to Westminster; more and more definitely the localities are gathered together in one central assembly—a process completed by the formation of “the Model Parliament,” 1295. But, meantime, important subsidiary processes were going on. Representation was assuming the elective form. Tenure as a constituent principle was weakening. The boroughs were gaining political weight. The clergy were constituting themselves into complete representative convocations. Taxation was changing in form; and juries of “recognition” were becoming the regular mode of assessing the new taxes on personalty.

It would be impossible to trace all these growths concurrently. It is necessary to distinguish essential principles and trace each separately. These principles, four in number, can be distinguished in the writ of 1295, the year of the model Parliament. The writ then issued to the sheriffs, orders them to send to Westminster two elected knights from each shire and two elected burgesses from each borough, to have full and sufficient power for themselves and the community of each shire and borough to do what shall then be by common counsel ordained. The essential points here were:—

**The Elements of**  
**Parliamentary**  
**Representation.**

- (A) The representation is of the shire. It was taken as consisting of all freeholders, whether of country or town, the former represented by knights and the latter by burgesses.
- (B) The representatives were elected; that is, they were to be real representatives.

1273]

(C) The purpose was taxation. They were not called merely to discuss or to inform the Government, but to *do something, i.e. to make a definite grant.*

(D) They meet the other estates (magnates and clergy).

The representatives are not merely the representatives of localities, but also all together represent one estate, *i.e.* a class with property and interests of its own; just as the lords had their separate standing, and the clergy, the spiritual estate, had theirs.

(A) When the Anglo-Norman kings looked round for an ally against their feudal baronage, or the Plantagenets for an ally against the aggres- The Shire. sions of the Papal Church, they found this ally in the old shire system of England.

The fact of this alliance is established by a series of evidences, chief of which are:—

(1) The order of Henry I. distinctly announcing his intention that the shire court and its lesser division, the court of the hundred, shall sit at the same time and place as in King Edward's day, and that all in the shire shall attend these courts.

(2) The use of shire and hundred courts by Henry II. as instruments for Royal needs; *e.g.* to settle cases of fiefs disputed between Crown and Church; to co-operate in keeping order and executing Royal justice under the severe assizes of Clarendon and Northampton; to assess the personal property of individuals and their liability to taxation; and also as an approved instrument for litigants to settle cases relating to lands, instead of using the brutal judicial combat.

(3) The status of the shire court in the reign of Richard I., 1194, when it had reached its fullest activity, and when its four leading knights would go round to arrange for a representative body of twelve knights or freeholders for each hundred, whose mere report could banish any notorious bad character from the realm, or put to the ordeal those suspected of crime; could decide what lands and feudal dues were the Crown's and what were not; could determine civil suits between subject and subject; and so on, down to the punishment of fraudulent weights and measures.

This was local "self-government" in the fullest and truest

sense. To raise it to central self-government, there was only needed the calling of these local representatives to a central assembly, and the working out for that assembly the control of all government. To accomplish the former was the task of the thirteenth century (1194-1295), to accomplish the latter needed four more centuries and five revolutions.

As to the union of shires in a central assembly, the first step in this process was in 1213, the meeting at St. Albans of four men and the reeve from every township in the Royal demesne, to assess the damage done to Church lands in the recent years of the Interdict. Later in the same year four knights from each shire were to meet at Oxford "to confer with the king on the affairs of the kingdom"; but this meeting never took place. In 1226, knights were called from eight shires to discuss some disputed articles in Magna Carta.

The early instances show that it was not till the struggle of the barons against the king's thirty years' misrule had forced men to reflect on the principles of government, that the calling of such a representative assembly came to be realised as important. The ministers had called the knights in 1254 as a last expedient to get a grant of money. In 1261 the barons having called knights to meet at St. Albans, the king was virtuously indignant at the idea of such an irregular meeting, and solemnly charged them to come "to Windsor and nowhere else"; and in the brief fifteen months of Simon de Montfort's actual power, he twice called a representative Parliament: one in June, 1264, and one more famous in January, 1265.

The fact was, that in the fierce political struggles of these years between the three groups of barons, who may be called the Royalist, the Aristocratic, and the Nationalist, the great question suddenly emerged: What was to be the constitution of England? The form in which we should now put such a question would be, How is the central assembly to be organised? Is its constitutive principle to be baronage, or military tenure, or representation? And if the last, What are to be the constituencies, and who to be the representatives?

In the thirteenth century all this is summed up in the question which meets us everywhere in the chroniclers, the constitutional documents, and the political songs of the time, What is the *communa*?

1273]

Now this word in its various forms—*communa*, *communitas*, *commun*—was a term which sometimes was as wide as our “nation,” *communa totius terrae*, but often, practically, was as narrow as baronial exclusiveness itself could wish; e.g. the committee of barons, elected 1258 *per communitatem*, are really elected by a knot of less than twenty leading men. But in each and all of its meanings it has a certain sense of organisation; and thus if men must take tenure in chief to be the organising principle of the English realm, then the *communa* must be the barons, and the barons only. But it was too late for such a baronial monopoly. Could military service then be taken as the principle? If so, the assembly might be representative, but would represent only the lesser chief-tenants and the rest of the class of knights. But this would have been an anachronism, now that the military aspect of feudalism had become unreal, and the knights were no longer a fighting class, but stay-at-home English gentry. Should the *communa* then be taken to be all who dwelt on English land? This would be too wide and vague a use. What senses then remained? The sense in which it had been consistently used, to denote the old shire-moot, the gathering of all freeholders in the shire, whether rural or urban, the *communitas scirae*. The assembly should be the *domus communitatum*, the house of assembled shire-moots. This is the sense in which De Montfort’s Parliament of 1265 was the first House of Commons—the sense in which Edward I., in the first Parliament after his landing in England, announced his having got a grant from the “Commons of the realm.” It was the final triumph of the shire as the unit of the English system. The union of Anglo-Saxon local institutions with Norman centralisation had at last been effected.

The Commons.

The union of the two classes, burgesses and knights, distinguishes our early Parliamentary growth from that of any other country. Nothing, then, can be a more important fact, yet it is not, for all that, an isolated one, but a simple consequence of the composition of the shire itself. From our earliest history the boroughs had been counted as parts of the shire; they sent their leading men to attend at the shire court before the king’s judges. The representation of the boroughs was a necessary corollary of the representation of the

*communitas scirae*. The older writers therefore exaggerated when they spoke of De Montfort as the founder of Parliaments; they failed, too, to notice that he treated the boroughs not as a part of the shire, but almost as a separate estate (viewing them, in fact, as Continental *municipia*, not as English boroughs).

(B) The representatives were elected.

This was not so obvious and natural a thing as it now seems to us. Thus the feudal theory itself

**The Elective  
Principle.**

professed to supply a sort of representation; the lord grants an aid for himself and his

vassals, even including the villans.

In fact, the greater value of elected representatives over nominated was a financial discovery which was made during the latter part of the twelfth century, but was not distinctly applied to purposes of Parliament till 1254.

Again, it was quite possible that the expansion of the Great Council, which was seen to be inevitable, might be attempted by simply calling representatives of the lesser tenants-in-chief. This would have given an assembly of lesser nobles, whose class spirit would kill Parliament; and this was often in the fourteenth century declared, though erroneously, to be the proper theory of the Commons. Fortunately, tenure was already too effete by the middle of the thirteenth century to be relied on; and these lesser chief-tenants had sunk into the shire; the lesser nobles had become gentry.

(C) It was in this way that tenure was replaced by representation as the constituent principle of the legislative assembly. The one decisive influence throughout all this process was the influence of taxation.

Its importance in our English history has been immense;

**Taxation as a  
Factor in English  
History,**

the constitutional history might, in fact, be written, so to speak, in terms of taxation. The improvement of the judicial system in the twelfth century originated as a mode of gathering taxes; the Royal administration was primarily a tax-collecting agency, and the growth of Parliament was necessitated by new forms of taxation. Thus the feudal aid, which was the earliest form of tax, being in theory a voluntary gift, established the principle that taxation requires the subjects' assent. When the new taxes on personalty came in, this assent was made a



1273]

greater reality by the tax-payers' help being required for assessment and collection; gradually the separate negotiations with each shire were simplified by calling the representatives of each shire to meet all at once and settle the grant. This is best seen by examining closely the action of Edward I. in the year 1290. He had in May called a feudal council to pass an important land statute; this council also granted him a feudal aid. Such an aid would be worth about £18,000; but in view of his great needs, <sup>and in the Formation of Parliament.</sup> it occurred to him that he might do better to get a wider national grant which would include personalty as well as land, and would be worth at least £40,000. He therefore called, in July, knights from each shire who made the desired grant.

Thus it is clear that as late as 1290, so great a man as Edward I. still regarded the old feudal council as adequate for all purposes of government except the new form of taxation; for this, and this alone, he deemed a representative assembly necessary. The same feeling is clear in his treatment of the clergy; he laid down the maxim that they must at least pay, since the laity both pay and fight; the clergy possessed spiritualities, and spiritualities must bear their share of national burdens; and therefore the clergy must also be formed into a representative estate. In this policy, after a hard struggle, he succeeded; only his weaker successors yielded to a compromise which saved for the clergy their cherished independence, with results fatal in the end to themselves.

(D) The last step to complete a Parliament was to bring the three estates together. The estate of the magnates had by long tradition been settled <sup>The Estates Combined.</sup> in the form of a small assembly of greater tenants-in-chief; what Edward I. did here was to intensify its tendency to restriction, practically reducing the number of peers to about one-half of what it had been, and exercising a considerable freedom of selection as to the individuals composing it. The clergy had been rapidly forming themselves for their own purposes into a representative body, or rather, two bodies—the Convocations of Canterbury and York. These Edward united into one Parliamentary estate of clergy; and at last, not till 1295, called all three estates at the same place and time to treat of the same business. It is curious to see

that even after De Montfort's Parliament, containing magnates, though few in number, a great body of clergy, and a Commons of knights and burgesses, it still required thirty years to work out into permanent form the Parliament of three estates. There were probably seven Parliaments called in this interval, but in each there was some incompleteness and imperfection, such as absence of the burgesses or absence of the clergy; and 1295 was the first date in which each estate was properly constituted and all three met at once. An "Estate" means a class capable of a separate taxation: the three estates were thus—land, spiritualities, chattels. By this means a double character was given to the Parliament; it was a representation of the nation in its great classes, as well as a representation of the nation in its local communities. The former character it has now completely lost, there is no representation of classes as such; the latter is very much changed by the substitution of electoral districts for real *communitates*.

**The Early Parliaments, and Parliament to-day.**

A review of the early period of Parliamentary history brings clearly before us:—

(1) The slowness of its growth. It may be said that our jury-system and our Parliament, the two most characteristic and most imitated of English institutions, have the same root; and this root goes far back into the old Germanic life. The first use of elected representatives to act for their shires is at least as old as Henry I.; and even the calling them to a central body took eighty-two years (1213-95) to work out.

**Summary.**

This means that the system was well tried and tested on the smaller scale first; representation was applied to petty local affairs long before it was raised to a greater sphere; the Parliament stood firm because its foundations were laid deep in national habit; and English self-government has lasted for centuries, because it had been itself the slow product of centuries.

(2) The political system is a reflection of the social system. Nothing is more fundamental in the modern view of politics than the determination of the question, Who shall have the franchise—who shall have political right? This question, we should say, must be the very first point determined before any representative system can be set up. Yet this point, in

1273]

the early days of our Parliamentary history, was never determined at all, was never even touched on; the first actual legislation upon the point was not till 1430—more than a century afterwards, when the right was declared to belong to freeholders of forty shillings a year and upwards. The point was, in fact, never explicitly determined in the early period, because it was never consciously raised. The political framework was merely the framework of society as it stood. That society, framed upon feudal ideas, regarded only the freeholder as an integral part of itself. The freeholders constituted the shire-moot. The House of Commons meant the House of assembled Shire-moots. So the Commons were simply the freeholders.

(3) The foundation of Parliament was no new departure; it was not a revolution. It altered none of the old landmarks; it made no new divisions. It was no electoral system, suspended in the air, invisible except when it descends to earth at polling times, with electoral divisions arithmetically marked out, and electors who have no tie or bond, except that once in seven years they all drop a paper into the ballot-box on the same day.

UNDER John the history of the Church is the history of the State. Under Henry III. the scene is changed.

The Popes preserved the throne for the young king, and when he was firmly seated on it, and grown to man's estate, they demanded the payment which their own designs made necessary. Demands for the Pope's wars multiplied, till the archbishop, Edmund Rich, left England in despair. Protest after protest was drawn up, the most famous being a letter of the rectors of Berkshire in 1240, in which they exclaimed against the scandal that had arisen throughout the world against the Roman Church on account of its exactions, and declared that the patrimony of other churches was in no wise liable to assessment by or tribute to the Roman Pontiff. Again the Church was flooded with foreign prelates. The king's half-brothers and the kinsmen of his wife poured into the land to fatten on the ecclesiastical revenues, and the Popes, by "provision," gave the best benefices to men of their

W. H. HUTTON.  
The Church.

Allen Ecclesiastica.

own court. The weakness of the king and the torpor of the bishops allowed these abuses to be multiplied, and the chronicles are full of cries of distress and appeals to the tradition of national independence. Two gleams of light alone relieve the darkness of the picture. One is the life of Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, the other, the coming of the Friars.

Robert Grosseteste was for eighteen years, 1235 to 1253, the foremost Churchman in the land; first in **Grosseteste.** internal reform of the Church, first in the support of barons against king, first in resistance to papal aggression. He was the friend of Simon de Montfort, and the tutor of his son, and the keen supporter of all attempts at political reform. From him the bishops, such as Walter de Cantilupe, learnt to stand together for the freedom of the people. From him the clergy gained courage to withstand the corruption of the times and the exactions of the Popes. "Struck with amazement," says Matthew Paris, "at the avarice of the Romans, he caused his clerks carefully to reckon and estimate all the revenues of foreigners in England, and it was discovered and found for truth that the present Pope, Innocent IV., had pauperised the whole Church more than all his predecessors from the time of the primitive papacy. The revenue of the alien clerks, whom he had planted in England, and whom the Church had enriched, amounted to 70,000 marks, while the king's revenue could not be reckoned at more than a third of that sum."

When the Pope required him to institute to a prebend in his own cathedral his nephew, a boy not ordained and who had no intention of even visiting England, he replied in a letter which is the most striking instance of English feeling against Rome that is to be found in the history of the Middle Ages; and almost with his last breath he appealed "to the nobles of England and the citizens of London and the community of the whole realm" against the injury which the English Church was receiving from foreign intruders, "who not only strive to tear off the fleece, but do not even know the features of their flock."

Such protests as those of Grosseteste might seem to have borne little fruit. But the Church was being **The Friars.** more surely regenerated from within. In 1220 the Dominicans first landed in England; in 1224 the

1273]

Franciscans. Scholars and preachers, the former found a ready welcome at Oxford. The latter soon followed, and before long made the theological faculty their own. Both were not only leaders in learning, but expressed for the people from whom they were sprung the needs of the day and the views of the villans as to the great issues and the great men. The Oxford Franciscans had Grosseteste in 1224 for their Rector, and twelve years later numbered Adam of Marsh among their brethren. The two were lifelong friends. Adam was one of the most eminent men of his day; he was a familiar guest at Court, as well as an assiduous lecturer at Oxford; a counsellor of Simon de Montfort, too, no less than of the king; and all the time he strictly followed the rule of S. Francis, "serving the wretched and the vile, and performing the prime and essential duties of a friar." For the early friars were not only the leaders of a great spiritual revival and the inaugurators of an intellectual movement; they were, above all, the apostles of a social mission. The monastic orders had done their chief work in the country districts; the mendicants were the missionaries of the towns. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the cities had grown greatly, and outside the walls, in the crowded courts, or in the marshes by the river, there herded masses of men and women, neglected and outcast. Amid these multitudes the foul plague of leprosy—and under this name no doubt many other diseases were included—stalked like a remorseless demon; and there the friars from the first sought and found their work. All Franciscan novices were made to undergo a period of training in leper hospitals, and then the friars settled, where we may see the names of the friaries still remain, in the most crowded parts of the towns. From their work came the first impulse of the Middle Ages towards the study of medicine, and the good that they did in the mitigation of some of the worst forms of human suffering is incalculable. The whole idea of the religious life was enlarged by their action; the gulf that had been fixed between it and the secular profession was bridged by their example. The enrolment among their numbers of men still engaged in their own callings and possessing their own property but pledged to good works of charity and mercy under their guidance, must have enormously elevated the standard of social life. From

the time when they abandoned the restrictions which S. Francis had placed on learning, they became the leaders of English culture; and before the end of Henry III.'s reign they were as supreme in the sphere of education as they were in missionary and philanthropic work.

Robert Kilwardby became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1273, and before this Bonaventura had refused the Archbishopric of York. Both were Franciscans. Alexander Hales, Duns Scotus, and Roger Bacon were the English leaders of a revolution in the world of thought. Thus, by the accession of Edward I., through the wisdom of individual prelates and the great work of the friars, the Church in England had more than recovered from the severe blows it had undergone at the hands of John. The corporate life of the Church was organised and consolidated: the clerical estate had organisation and did not lack leaders. It remained to be seen how to meet the difficulties that might arise between a strong church and a strong king.

THE history of mediæval England cannot be studied even cursorily without its being apparent that the Church exercised, politically and socially, as well as in religion, a profound influence on the national life. This influence was supreme in its own sphere, and unchallenged. During the period of which we have spoken there were practically no competing forces. There were no heretics and no dissenters. The foreign sect whose disciples reached England in Henry II.'s reign made but one convert, and she was a wretched woman (*muliercula* says the chronicler) who recanted at the first sign of persecution. Within the Church theological warfare was at rest; outside the Jews were the only non-Christian body of whom homedwelling English folk had any knowledge. It is thus of great interest to know what was the attitude which the supreme religious society adopted towards the infidels within the area of its rule. The Church was not, as a body, harsh towards the

**The Church and  
National Life.**

**The Church and  
the Jews.**

Jews. There are many acts recorded of individual friendship and kindness. Jewish physicians were friendly and honoured by Christians; monastic societies held amicable relations with Jewish

1273]

bodies; the chroniclers, all of them monks or ecclesiastics, rarely, if ever, speak approvingly of outrages on Jews. Still, as time went on, and Jews in England grew rich upon the profits of the usury which they alone might exercise, more bitter feelings sprang up. From 1144, the date of the first recorded charge of murder of a Christian boy, the Jews began to suffer from time to time from accusations most often false and judgments generally hasty. The prominent cases of this kind created quite a new cult in England. The boy martyr's shrine became not seldom the most popular in the cathedral. S. William of Norwich in 1144, Harold of Gloucester in 1168, Robert of Edmundsbury in 1181, a nameless boy in London in 1244, buried with great pomp at S. Paul's, and S. Hugh of Lincoln in 1255, are the most prominent instances. It is difficult to refuse all credit to stories so circumstantial and so frequent; but on the other hand it may be said that the tales are too many for them all to be true, and most of them may be dismissed as wholly fictions. It is at least clear that even here the clergy were not pledged to persecutions. We learn from Matthew Paris and from the Burton Annals that the mendicant orders successfully pleaded for the pardon of Jews charged with a crime of this kind. The general attitude of the clerical order then was tolerant, and the toleration may be ascribed to the undisputed power of the Church.

What this power was in greater towns, and in the nation at large, the general history of the time abundantly illustrates. More obscurely hidden are the facts which tell of its influence in the country districts. Here the work of the monasteries in the twelfth and of the friars in the thirteenth century was a direct work of evangelising and civilisation. Churches rose in the thinly-peopled shires which still bear witness to the practical nature of the popular devotion. Round the parish church the village life centred, and in the smaller towns the guild-association, starting quite in the heart of the country at Burford in the eleventh century, worked in close connection with a common faith and a common worship. The parish priests were generally simple, if ignorant, men. Their standard of life was at least as high as that of their superiors in office and much higher than that of the society in which they lived. Superstition, it is undoubted, was almost universal;

**The Church in the  
Rural Districts.**



but it was a kindly superstition, lit up by many gleams of intelligence. When we read that in East Anglia there appeared one harvest-time, no man knew whence, two children, a boy and a girl, "completely green in their persons, and clad in garments of a strange colour and unknown materials," we learn also that these strange visitors were most kindly welcomed, baptised into the fellowship of the Church, and cherished "till at length they changed their original colour through the natural effect of our food." William of Newburgh tells also a story of country religion which is not without a beauty, as well as a quaintness, of its own. One Ketell, a villan, in the service of a certain clerk named Ham, dwelling at Farneham in Yorkshire, had the strange gift of seeing the evil spirits who plagued mankind. Still he lived on simply as before, making no profession of superiority to his neighbours, only regarding not matrimony but embracing the single life, abstaining from the eating of flesh and the wearing of linen, and ever as his work allowed attending the daily offices in the village church, the first to enter and the last to depart. The spirit of devotion was kept alive by anchorites, living in caves and by unfrequented streams, to whom the people would make pilgrimage to learn from their simple faith, and wonder at their austere holiness. One of the most beautiful passages in the narrative of William, the prior of Newburgh, is his account of how he saw Godric, the hermit of Finchale on the Wear by Durham, a few days before his death—an old and ignorant man, but full of "a surprising dignity and grace." It is indeed a relief to turn from the wars and wranglings of the great barons and great ecclesiastics to watch the progress of humanity and gentle deeds as the Church spread her hands over the by-paths and the secluded nooks of country life.

DURING the period which divides the coronation of Henry II. (1154) from the coronation of Edward I.

**P. W. MATTLAND.**  
Growth of  
Jurisprudence,  
1154—1272.

(1272) definite legislation was still an uncommon thing. Great as were the changes due to Henry's watchful and restless activity, they were changes that were effected without the pomp of solemn law-making. A few written or even spoken words communicated to his justices, those justices whom he was

1273]

constantly sending to perambulate the country, might do great things, might institute new methods of procedure, might bring new classes of men and of things within the cognisance of the royal court. Some of his ordinances—or “assizes,” as they were called—have come down to us; others we have lost. No one was at any great pains to preserve their text, because they were regarded, not as new laws, but as mere temporary instructions which might be easily altered. They soon sink into the mass of unenacted “common law.” Even in the next, the thirteenth, century some of Henry’s rules were regarded as traditional rules which had come down from a remote time, and which might be ascribed to the Conqueror, the Confessor, or any other king around whom a mist of fable had gathered.

Thus it came about that the lawyers of Edward I.’s day—and that was the day in which a professional class of temporal lawyers first became prominent in England—thought of *Magna Carta* as the oldest statute of the realm, the first chapter in the written law of the land, the earliest of those texts the very words of which are law. And what they did their successors do at the present day. The Great Charter stands in the forefront of our statute book, though of late years a great deal of it has been repealed. And certainly it is worthy of its place. It is worthy of its place just because it is no philosophical or oratorical declaration of the rights of man, nor even of the rights of Englishmen, but an intensely practical document, the fit prologue for those intensely practical statutes which English Parliaments will publish in age after age. What is more, it is a grand compromise, and a fit prologue for all those thousands of compromises in which the practical wisdom of the English race will always be expressing itself. Its very form is a compromise—in part that of a free grant of liberties made by the king, in part that of a treaty between him and his subjects, which is to be enforced against him if he breaks it. And then in its detailed clauses it must do something for all those sorts and conditions of men who have united to resist John’s tyranny—for the bishop, the clerk, the baron, the knight, the burgess, the merchant—and there must be some give and take between these classes, for not all their interests are harmonious. But even in the Great Charter there is not much new law; indeed, its own theory of

itself (if we may use such a phrase) is that the old law, which a lawless king has set at naught, is to be restored, defined, covenanted, and written.

The Magna Carta of our statute-book is not exactly the charter that John sealed at Runnymede ; it is a charter granted by his son and successor, Henry III., the text of the original document having been modified on more than one occasion. Only two other acts of Henry's long reign attained the rank of statute law. The Provisions of Merton, enacted by a great assembly of prelates and nobles, introduced several novelties, and contain those famous words, "We will not have the laws of England changed," which were the reply of the barons to a request made by the bishops, who were desirous that our insular rule "Once a bastard always a bastard" might yield to the law of the universal Church, and that marriage might have a retroactive effect. Among Englishmen there was no wish to change the laws of England. If only the king and his foreign favourites would observe those laws, then—such was the common opinion—all would be well. A change came ; vague discontent crystallised in the form of definite grievances. After the Barons' War the king, though he had triumphed over his foes, and was enjoying his own again, was compelled to redress many of those grievances by the Provisions of Marlborough, or, as they have been commonly called, the Statute of Marlbridge. When, a few years afterwards, Henry died, the written, the enacted law of England consisted in the main of but four documents, which we can easily read through in half an hour—there was the Great Charter, there was the sister-charter which defined the forest law, there were the Statutes of Merton and of "Marlbridge." To these we might add a few minor ordinances ; but the old Anglo-Saxon dooms were by this time utterly forgotten, the law-books of the Norman age were already unintelligible, and even the assizes of Henry II., though but a century old, had become part and parcel of "the common law," not to be distinguished from the unenacted rules which had gathered round them. Englishmen might protest that they would not change the law of England, but as a matter of fact the law of England was being changed very rapidly by the incessant decisions of the powerful central court.

1273]

It is with the second half of the thirteenth century that we find the military art begin to show signs of rapid development in England, and that the tactics which made the English name so great in war in the fourteenth century begin to appear. The habitual use of the long-bow, a weapon in every respect superior to the cross-bow, first appears as established in the Assize of Arms of 1252, when all holders of forty shillings in land or nine marks in chattels are desired to provide themselves with "a sword, dagger, bow and arrows." Whence the English got their long-bow is not quite easy to decide; the Normans at Hastings—as the Bayeux Tapestry clearly shows—still used the short four-foot bow, not the great six-foot weapon with its cloth-yard arrow. It was the short-bow, too, that won the Battle of the Standard. Probably the Anglo-Norman learnt to use the long-bow from the south Welsh, whose enormous bows and heavy arrows are celebrated by Giraldus Cambrensis in the last quarter of the twelfth century. Giraldus had seen the archers of Gwent send a shaft into a four-inch door so that the point stood out on the further side. At any rate, the long-bow was well known by the second half of the thirteenth century, though it was reserved for Edward I. to exalt it as the great national weapon. But in the French wars of Henry III., and even as late as the Welsh war of 1281, we find the cross-bow still held in high esteem, perhaps even in higher esteem than the rival that was ere long to supersede it.

C. OMAN.  
Warfare.

So long as the navy of England was chiefly composed of semi-irregular forces that were summoned to the king's service only upon stated occasions, or when their help was urgently required, there was always much lawlessness in the narrow seas. This lawlessness was increased rather than diminished by the growth of the influence and importance of the Cinque Ports, which, although they had possessed charters and privileges from an early period, did not become a considerable power in the realm until the reign of Henry III. That monarch, in 1229, issued an "ordinance touching the service of shipping" to

W. LAIRD-CLOWES.  
The Navy.  
1216-72.

The  
Cinque Ports.

be furnished by them, and, since the ordinance well explains their position and duties, and may fairly be regarded as the beginning of their greatness, it is worth quoting.

"These," it runs, "are the ports of the King of England, having liberties which other ports have not, that is to say, as more fully appeareth in the charters thereof made:—Hastings, to which pertaineth as members one town on the seashore, in Seaford, Pevensey, Bulvarhithe, Hydney, Iham, Beaksborne, Grench, and Northye. The services thereof due to our lord the king, twenty-one ships, and in every ship twenty-one men with one boy, which is called a gromet. Winchelsea and Rye as members, that is to say, Winchelsea ten ships, and Rye five ships, with men and boys as above; Romney, to which pertaineth Promhill, Lyd, Oswaldstone, Dengemarsch, and Old Romney, five ships, with men and boys as above; Hithe, to which pertaineth Westhithe, five ships, with men and boys as above; Dover, to which pertaineth Folkstone, Feversham, and Margate, not of soil but of chattels, twenty-one ships, as Hastings, with men and boys as above; Sandwich, to which pertaineth Fordwich, Reculver, Sarre, Storrey, and Deale, not of soil, but of chattels, five ships, with men and boys as above; being fifty-seven ships, one thousand one hundred and forty men, and fifty-seven boys, in all one thousand one hundred and ninety-seven persons. The service which the Barons of the Cinque Ports acknowledge to do to the King at the summons of the service by forty days before the going out, viz., yearly, if it shall happen, for fifteen days at their own cost, so that the first day be reckoned from the day on which they shall hoist up the sails of the ships to sail to the parts to which they ought to go, and further, as long as the King will, to be kept by ordinance of the King."

Besides the duty of furnishing ships and mariners, says Nicolas, the barons of the Cinque Ports have, for many centuries, performed an honorary service at the coronation of the kings and queens of England; the earliest instance of which was the coronation of Eleanor of Provence, consort of Henry III., in 1236.

Already, in 1226, the Cinque Ports had been very useful against Savery de Maloleone, a powerful French piratical baron, and others, and had, in the interests of their Sovereign, "slain and plundered like pirates." Forty years later, under

1273]

Henry de Montfort, they began to presume upon their power, and no longer attacked merely those who might be supposed to be the enemies of their country. To such an extent was their audacity carried, that when, in 1264, the Pope sent a cardinal legate to reconcile the king and the barons, they prevented his landing. Indeed, their piratical depredations at about that time are reported to have enhanced the price of all foreign goods in England. The institution, therefore, though in war-time it was occasionally valuable, was by no means an unmixed boon. To put it plainly, the Cinque Ports, in their early years, were little better than nests of chartered sea-robbers. More than once Henry III. made compensation to people who had been plundered by these freebooters.

They were, unfortunately, by no means the only pirates on the coasts at the time. There was Sir William de Marish, a proscribed murderer, who seized Lundy, made of it a piratical stronghold, and even began to build a ship there. Lynn, Dartmouth, and some of the small ports in Norfolk, harboured pirates in plenty. And there was the celebrated Eustace the Monk, who, though he fought sometimes for England and sometimes for France, was always a pirate in his methods. Akin to the pirates, and almost equally dangerous to peaceable persons, were the privateers, a class of irregulars which Henry III. was the first English king to license. He granted, in fact, what later would have been called formal letters of marque. "Know ye," declares one of these documents, dated 1243, "that we have granted and given licence to Adam Robernolt and William Le Sauvage, and their companions whom they take with them, to annoy our enemies by sea or by land wheresoever they are able, so that they share with us the half of all their gain."

The increase in the dimensions of ships continued, and we read of vessels having decks and cabins, and more than one mast. When Eustace the Monk was captured after the sea-fight in 1217, he was found concealed in the hold of one of the prizes; and when, in 1228, a vessel was ordered to be sent to Gascony with the king's effects, a small sum of money was paid "for making a chamber in the said ship to place the king's things in." In 1242 the cabins for the king and queen were directed to be wainscoted. We do not know exactly what were the dimensions of the largest English ships of the

period, but they may well have been similar, if not superior, to those of the largest of Continental vessels. The particulars of the finest of a number of ships furnished by Venice to France in 1268 have been preserved. She was 110 ft. long, 40 ft. broad, and 11½ ft. deep in the hold, and the height between decks on the main deck was 6½ ft. Her complement was one hundred and ten officers and men. A vessel of these dimensions must have been of between four and five hundred tons burthen—about as large, that is, as a twenty-gun ship of Nelson's days. As for English seamanship, it was already celebrated. In 1270, during a storm in the Mediterranean, the English squadron was the only part of the allied fleet that escaped without loss. On the coasts lights and beacons began to be regularly maintained, quays and piers to be built, and provision to be made to prevent the silting up of certain harbours and estuaries. There were dockyards of some kind not only at Portsmouth, but also at Rye, Winchelsea, Shoreham, and elsewhere; and vessels laid up in ordinary seem to have been usually protected by means of sheds. Naval pay did not increase. Masters were paid sixpence, and mariners threepence a day as in earlier times.

Of the naval tactics of the period we know something from the accounts that have been preserved of the great English victory gained in the Strait of Dover in 1217. The English sought and secured the weather gage, and then bore down, grappled the enemy, and maintained the closest possible action. Bows, cross-bows, slings, swords, axes, lances and unslaked lime were employed; and the galleys, the overhanging bows of which were shod with iron, were successfully used as rams. From the masthead of the commander's ship a banner was displayed by day, and a lantern by night; and directions were given by the officers of the Cinque Ports that in battle efforts should be made to cut adrift the hostile commander's banner, with the object of throwing his fleet into confusion.

It is during the reign of Henry III. that the magnet seems to have been first commonly used for purposes of navigation by European seamen. A French versifier of the early part of the thirteenth century describes the rude mariner's compass of his day in language which may be translated as follows:—"This star" (the Pole Star) "moves not. 'They make a



1273]

contrivance which, thanks to the virtue of the magnet, an ugly brownish stone to which iron readily joins itself, cannot lie. They observe the right point after they have caused the needle to touch it; and they put the needle (placed in a rush) into water, without anything more, and the rush keeps it afloat. Then it turns at once its point with such certainty towards the star that no man may doubt it, nor will anything induce it to mislead. When the sea is dark and lowering, and they can see neither star nor moon, they place a light by the needle, and then they have no fear of going wrong." Another versifier speaks of a cork instead of a rush having been used as a float. But it is clear that even at this early period the properties of the loadstone had long been known.

Towards commerce the Government was well disposed. In his great charter of liberties, Henry undertook that foreign merchants should have safe-conducts to enter and quit England, and, while in the country, might trade freely by land or water without injury, according to old and lawful customs, except in war-time. If any merchants belonging to a country that had declared war with England were in the king's territories at the outbreak of hostilities, they were to be attached, though without injury to their persons or goods, until the king knew in what manner the merchants of his dominions were being treated by the hostile State; and "if our merchants be well treated there, theirs shall likewise be so treated with us." During several of the wars with France, trade between the two countries was actually interfered with only to a very slight extent; and when it was interfered with, the interference was usually begun by France, and continued by England merely as a measure of retaliation.

WE have already seen how the Norman manner of building had slowly given way before the advance of the Early English style. The tide had begun to flow as far back as the reign of Henry; it had suddenly swelled to a great volume in the last years of Richard, until (under his brother John) the change was complete, and the last traces of Norman form, structure, feeling, and detail had been finally submerged. It was but natural, therefore, that the reign of John's son should not be a

**R. HUGHES.**  
**Art and**  
**Architecture.**

period of architectural change, for it represents the manhood and old age of the new style, just as the reigns of his father and uncle represent its boyhood and infancy. The elegant forms that had been carried from Canterbury to Rochester, and from Lincoln to Ely, are not changed—they are only developed and applied—in the chapter-house at Oxford, the choir of Worcester, the “nine altars” at Durham, and the south transept at York. The round termination to the east end has now practically disappeared, at least in thoroughly English churches, and the square end with its groups of lancets (Ely is, perhaps, the most perfect specimen) has supplanted the apse.

By a piece of rare good fortune we have one great church built in this most perfect and national style, and which, owing to the fortuitous destruction of later additions, is an example almost throughout of pure Early English work. This is the Cathedral of Salisbury, commenced by Bishop Poore on a new site in 1220, and finished by Bishop Bridport in 1258. The spire is, it is true, “an afterthought” of the fourteenth century; but it was built by an architect who did not deem himself wiser than his forefathers, and is in admirable keeping with the rest of the church. Though by no means one of our largest cathedrals, it had the good fortune to be early recognised as the perfect national type, with the result that, when modifications of the old Norman Cathedrals were undertaken, they were most frequently assimilated to the plan of Salisbury. No doubt it lacks the richness of the style that was to follow; no doubt it misses the sublime sense of strength that belonged to that which preceded it; but for excellence of workmanship, for magnificence depending on the ordered beauty of the composing lines, for the elegance arising from the multiplicity of finely-executed forms, it remains unrivalled. Elegance, indeed, appears to have spoken its last word in its clustered pillars with their light open shafts, in its tapering vaults, its light mouldings along the groins of the roof, its sparse enrichments of violette and the conventional folded leaf which we call the crocket. In Salisbury nothing seems done for effect, either in mass or ornament; the minimum of visible effort seems aimed at, and this difficult aim seems perfectly achieved. In one point only does Salisbury fail, and that is in the poor doorways

1273]

and mean and parcelled west front. It is just in the west fronts that almost all English cathedrals fail, and almost all French cathedrals succeed. The great exception belongs, it is true, to this style, and is found in the triple porch at Peterborough, which is probably slightly earlier than Salisbury; yet grandiose and magnificent as is this porch (the great arches are eighty-one feet high), it is a thing apart, having no reference to the cathedral behind it—an astounding *tour de force*, but constructively meaningless and insincere.

London, generally so poor in churches, is fortunate in possessing the great Abbey of St. Peter at Westminster; yet, strange to say, our national “abbey” is the most un-English of our great ecclesiastical buildings. It was in 1245, as Salisbury was approaching its completion, that Henry, mindful of the devotion he had towards St. Edward the Confessor, ordered the Norman church of St. Peter to be enlarged. To do the king justice, he <sup>Westminster Abbey Transformed.</sup> had always been mindful of the Confessor, for in the fourth year of his reign he had laid the foundations of a lady chapel at the extremity of the old Norman choir. But now, twenty-five years later, he proceeded to carry out a much more ambitious scheme. He pulled down the whole of the east end of the church, the Norman choir and transepts, and even part of the nave, and then, with the aid of the “most subtle artificers, English and foreign,” he rebuilt them. The choir and apse, with the choir chapels, seem to have been first built, then the transepts, and one bay of the nave, while the work on the chapter-house must have gone on with that on the choir. In the centre he erected a stately tomb, and there he set the bones of the Confessor. Nothing was spared by the king to make this greatest of all our abbey churches sumptuous. He introduced glass mosaic in the decorations, coloured glass in the windows, and fresco painting on the flat spaces. The walls, to the top of the triforium, he covered with diaper,\* <sup>Diaper.</sup> probably gilt and painted as brightly as an illumination.

\* The patterns known as “diaper” seem to have been originally taken from Persian silks or other Eastern fabrics, and the word is probably Persian and akin to jasper, the reference being to the various colours of that stone. The word in its early use in France (whence it came to England) seems to have meant rather an arrangement of variegated colours than a chequered

A special effect of richness, too, was given to the triforium by a double arcading, by overlaying the mouldings with sculptured foliage, the large arches being filled with two smaller ones with pointed trefoil heads, and carrying above a foliated circle with a triple ornament on the cusps. The finest part of Henry's work is, however, in the transepts, which are spacious and broad-spreading, and quite English in character. This is, however, the only part of his work of which this can be truly said, for the proportion of height to the other dimensions of his choir and fragmentary nave are quite unlike anything to be found elsewhere in England. Beyond the transepts foreign influence is dominant, though the east end of Westminster wears a less foreign air to-day than in the century of its erection. Henry VII.'s chapel now occupies a large part of the space where stood that dedicated to Our Lady by Henry III., and this, according to the original design, formed the centre of a ring of apsidal chapels, an arrangement than which nothing could be more typically French. Westminster Abbey is, indeed, only one bit of evidence corroborating the fact that the King of England, who, by the loss of the Angevin and Norman provinces, was king of little else, was still half a Frenchman, and that the heart which after death was to belong to the Abbey of Fontévrault, had in life scant sympathy with the English genius.

It was the mere malice of Fate which made King Henry the builder of the chapter-house, where the  
**The Chapter-House of Westminster.** Commons (that part of the hated institution of Parliament which he hated worst) was subsequently to find a home for two centuries. It is a typical specimen of the Early English chapter-house. In form it belongs to the rounded buildings, either hexagonal or octagonal, which entirely superseded the rectangular shape dear to the Normans. They had indeed erected at Worcester a monks' council-room of this pattern, supported by a central column, convenient for penitential purposes. This had been imitated at Lincoln, and reached its perfect development in

design. By a curious accident the place in Europe which became famous for the manufacture of textiles in which these designs were imitated was the Flemish town of Ypres, and this has given rise to a false etymology (like that which finds Mars' Hill in Areopagus), which explains diaper as a corrupt form of d'Ypres.

1273]

the beautiful edifice at Westminster. It soon became the pattern of all future chapter-houses, until, in the time of Edward I. the central pillar was done away with, and a perfect Gothic dome was for the first time erected. To make this chapter-house of Westminster, the Abbey itself was, in Dean Stanley's phrase, "made to disgorge one-third of its southern transept" to form the eastern cloister by which it is reached from the chancel. Over its entrance, from a mass of sculpture, gilding, and painting, the Virgin Mother looked down both within and without. The vast windows were filled with painted glass, and the walls covered with a series of frescoes. The existing frescoes from the Apocalypse, even the oldest of them, are not earlier than the fourteenth, and a portion are probably of the fifteenth century. But probably the original paintings were in part reproduced, and they may be regarded as giving some measure of the excellence attained in the art of design in Early English times. It is satisfactory to be able to note that this noble and most instructive example has been admirably restored, and the six windows, replaced after the pattern of the seventh (a blank one), which fortunately survived, are being gradually refilled with painted glass. We may, therefore, soon be able to see "the incomparable" chapter-house, as Matthew of Westminster calls it, as it looked to the astonished eyes of the thirteenth-century Englishman. Nor was the art of painting limited to the decoration of churches, for in the account rolls of Henry's reign we find entries of heavy payments to artists. Thus in 1239 there is a payment to Odo and Edward his son of 117 shillings and 10 pence for oil, varnish, and colours bought, and for pictures executed for the queen's chamber; and in 1259 a similar payment to Master William the painter, for a Jesse (*i.e.*, a genealogical tree) for the mantel of the king's chamber.

**Ecclesiastical  
Decoration.**

The sculptor's art seems to have found less favour at Westminster. To see what Englishmen could do in that way we must travel as far as Wells. That cathedral is another fine example of the pure architecture of this reign—at least, so far as the nave and west front are concerned. In date they are a little earlier than Westminster, as contemporary authorities tell us that Bishop Jocelyn, having pulled down all the west end,

**Wells  
Cathedral.**

rebuilt it from the foundation, and dedicated his work on October the 23rd, 1239. Of course, such extensive operations occupied many years, and certainly the nave looks a little older than the façade. But it is possible that the slight differences observable may only indicate that a different band of masons were at work on it, and on the whole it is more reasonable to believe that the west front is the earlier.

It is not, however, for the architecture alone that Wells Cathedral must be cited. It is because here—and here alone in England—we have evidence of the sudden outburst of talent

**Sculpture.**

in those plastic arts in which, though some Englishmen have attained high excellence in them, Englishmen, as a rule, have not excelled. Although isolated groups and figures occur earlier, and some of these date probably from the eleventh century, this work at Wells is the first in which the sculptor can be said to have played a great and independent part. Indeed, it would almost seem as if the west front had been made abnormally wide, for the purpose of better displaying that which is its most striking feature. The number of figures is prodigious, and nearly half—more than 150, in fact—are life-size or larger. There are crowned kings and queens, mitred churchmen, armed knights, and princes and nobles in costume, disposed in tiers, diversified with medallions. “In the first tier,” says the late Mr. Cockerell, who devoted half a lifetime to their examination, “are the personages of the first and second Christian missions to England; St. Paul; Joseph of Arimathea; St. Augustine and his followers. In the second are the angels chanting the ‘Gloria in Excelsis,’ and holding crowns spiritual and temporal, the rewards of their predication. In the third tier, to the south, are the subjects of the Old Testament, and to the north of the New. In the fourth and fifth we have an historical series of the lords spiritual and temporal, and of the saints and martyrs under whom the Church has flourished in this country; King Ina, founder of the conventual church of Wells; Edward the Elder, founder of the episcopal church; the Saxon, the Danish, the Norman, and the Plantagenet dynasties. Together with these are the founders of dynasties; daughters and allies by marriage of the royal houses of England; the leading characters and lords of the Church—as Archbishop Brithelm, St. Dunstan, Bishop Asser, Grimbald,



1273]

the Earl of Mercia—surrounding Alfred. They form a complete illustration of William of Malmesbury and the early historians of our country—a calendar for the learned men as well as for unlearned artists.”

This was indeed a sermon in stone, an entire lithic Bible, which all men with eyes could read, whereas previous efforts had not got beyond the plastic representation of a single text. Although it is impossible to accept all the conclusions of Mr. Cockerell—particularly as to the conscious illustration of chroniclers like Malmesbury—it is probable that a general idea such as he has endeavoured to outline runs through the work. There is less difficulty in making sure of the meaning of the medallions and some of the groups, such as The Creation of Eve and The Death of Jacob. It is not, however, the question of identity that is of the highest interest. The surprising thing is that we should find here figures which, besides being ingenious and expressive, exhibit genuine artistic feeling. The great Flaxman, indeed, whose passionate classicism made him a hostile critic of Gothic art, declared that, deficient in principle though they may be, and in places “rude and severe, they frequently possess a beautiful simplicity, an irresistible sentiment, and sometimes a grace excelling more modern productions.” But perhaps the most wonderful fact about this wonderful work is its date. We cannot put it later than about 1230 or 1235, and nothing fit to rank with it was then being done in northern Europe—for the monumental porches of France, formerly supposed to be contemporary, are now recognised as of a later date. We must cross the Alps to find work comparable with this at Wells, and the famous Nicolas of Pisa is, perhaps, the only contemporary artist who can fairly stand by the side of our nameless and forgotten countrymen.

Unhappily, sculpture was not destined to be in England a great instrument of popular teaching. A rival  
Painted Glass.  
 was at hand by whom it was in this respect to be supplanted. The presentation in stone was to hide its head before the glories of the painted window. It has been well said by a distinguished architect that the best synonym for Gothic would be the painted-glass style; and it is certain that the introduction of this beautiful window-material was a most potent agency in architectural development. Plain glass had



been—as we have already mentioned—used in churches as early as the eighth century; though in early times the material was, no doubt, either imported, or, if occasionally made in England, made by foreign artificers. For a long time, however, its capabilities as a form of decoration seem not to have been recognised; and, in fact, until well on in the twelfth century, glass seems to have been applied solely to the utilitarian purpose of keeping out the wind and rain. It may have been first used for decoration by William of Sens, who came from Becket's city of refuge to superintend the restoration of Canterbury after the great fire of 1174. He was doubtless cognisant of this, as of the other improvements introduced a generation earlier at St. Denis; so that it is probable that we owe to France, not only the Pointed style, but the painted window, which now seems its natural complement. The earliest works of the kind were, however, rather transparent glass mosaic than painted-glass windows; for the outlines were formed by the lead beading, into which the small plaques of glass (which were cut with a hot wire, the use of the diamond being unknown till the fifteenth century) were carefully fitted. This kind of design was, of course, independent of colour, though colour was no doubt the feature the addition of which gave the new windows such an extraordinary popularity. It is doubtful whether a reasonably complete specimen of a stained-glass window dating as early as the reign of John exists in England, though there are, doubtless, fragments of earlier date.

This earliest glass is recognisable by its extraordinary thickness, and owing to the fact that the colour is in the whole substance, and not merely—as in later examples—upon the surface, it is still unrivalled in richness of tone. It is believed to have been first systematically employed at Westminster during the rebuilding by Henry III. It is of great interest to compare these windows of Henry's with those of La Sainte Chapelle in Paris, which was commenced almost at the same date and finished earlier than the work at Westminster. The geometric form of tracery, which gives the greatest space for colour, can scarcely go beyond this French work, while the English is still in the tentative form. It is important to note in this connection that the manufacture of coloured glass does not seem to have been established in

1273]

England until centuries later, and the cost of the material seems to have made the development of tracery slower here than in France; but the result has hardly been regrettable.

There was, as we have seen, little positive change in the main structure of the church fabric during this reign; nor did the character of the ornament alter much. On the other hand, the windows were positively trans-  
figured, and tracery, with all its possibilities of luxuriant beauty, was born. With the  
introduction of painted glass, the fenestration, if we may be allowed the term, became of supreme importance.

**The Development  
of the Windows.**

At the beginning of the reign the tall, narrow, lancet form of window prevails, widely splayed within and plain without. The splay, originally adopted  
simply as a means of getting more light, lent itself, when the windows were grouped together, to new and striking effects. The inner partitions of the windows were, by means of the splay, reduced to a narrow edge, and when these edges were covered, as soon became common, by delicate shafts and mouldings, three or more windows, which on the outside were quite separate, within formed a triple or multiple window of admirable composition. A still more important development grew out of the analogous practice of including the group under a single arch, for this left between the tops of the grouped windows and the top of the arch a space of wall bare of decoration and unpleasing to the eye. It was in the effort to get rid of this that tracery was invented. The Early English architects were not, indeed, the first who had attempted the task. The Norman builders of St. Maurice's at York, of the choir of Peterborough, and of the tower of St. Giles's at Oxford, had tried to abate the eyesore by piercing the blank space of wall; but their efforts had not got beyond a puncture, which barely relieved the monotony of the surface. The new development consisted in the introduction of a window, circular or of quatrefoil design, cut in the wall above the window heads. These openings are, indeed, the first steps towards tracery. Such windows belong to the humbler kind, which the late Professor Willis admirably christened "plate-tracery," as distinguished from the later and more graceful forms, to which he gave the name of "bar-tracery." The distinction is

**Tracery.**

**"Plate-tracery" and  
"Bar-tracery."**

just and luminous, for the former is, in truth, the decorative piercing of a wall-space, while the latter is a decorative network laid into a window light.

Plate-tracery continues in vogue through the first half of Henry's reign, but the solid portions of the "plate" get smaller and smaller, narrow mullions supersede the solid divisions of the light, the use of cusps or pointed attachments become common, until (at least as early as 1260) we come upon veritable bar-tracery. The number of grouped lights increases at the same time, and the openings in the head are multiplied. The great stride towards perfect tracery effected by allowing the mullions to cross each other in the window-head must have been taken about the same time; and such windows are, in truth, in the form which was to obtain through all the "Decorated" period. You have, indeed, only to take the plain mullions from such a three-light window as that of St. Mary le Wigford, at Lincoln, and substitute for them bars on which the cusps are actually carved—not laid on as external ornament—and you have a perfect Decorated window. The circular windows of this time—the eyes of the Church, as the French call them—are equally instructive as to the gradual evolution of tracery. They were not unknown to the Norman builders, who, when the scale was comparatively large, frequently used a wheel pattern of six broad spokes to break the monotony of the light. This form persisted, and gave rise to such early examples as the famous window at Peterborough, which but for the elegant foliage which runs along the outer edge, and the *violette* which adorns the truncheon-like divisions, might well be mistaken for a Norman work. So, too, of the similar windows of Beverley Minster, where four round openings placed cross-wise are pierced in the larger circular plate and bordered with the half-*violette*, which in that form better justifies its English designation of "dog-tooth." Perhaps, however, the highest point of Early English plate-tracery is reached at Lincoln, where the window of the north transept, formed by a ring of small circles, surrounds four larger tennis-headed apertures, across the intersection of which hangs a small equal-limbed cross, with a *quatrefoil* in the centre. The spandrel-like portions of the disc, between the outer ring of circles and the tennis-heads, are further pierced by *trefoils* and rounds, so that here

1273]

the plate form, though still distinguishable, has almost disappeared. Yet this window may safely be given to the first decade of the reign of Henry III., and none of them are later than the third. These are the natural forerunners of the great circular windows—rose, or marigold, or catherine-wheel—which are among the principal glories of the Decorated style.

Except in disturbed and frontier districts, like South Wales, the reign of Henry III. was not prolific as regards castles—at least, if we speak of castles built on new sites. The frontier

Secular  
Architecture.

castles, moreover, were rather places of arms, intended to keep at a distance a warlike but imperfectly-armed population, than the impregnable strongholds of former and succeeding reigns. Their principal

Castles.

features are a strong curtain-wall, enclosing a considerable area fortified by round towers at irregular intervals, while the residential interior was constructed of wood. The round tower had come in as a French fashion in the reign of John, or possibly, in isolated cases, a little earlier; and these, as well as the older Norman keeps were, in this reign, generally strengthened by the addition of an *enceinte*. This was the case at London, and also at Dover, where the *enceinte* is double, the resulting stronghold fulfilling nearly all the conditions of the great concentric castles of the succeeding reign. An intervening form—a cylindrical keep with buttresses, such as is to be seen at Coningsburgh—is a little earlier, representing the transitional Norman form; while the round tower and the curtained tower defences, and the *enceinte* wall, represent the work of the Early English castle-builder. The round tower was not, perhaps, architecturally an improvement on the rectangular Norman keep; but it was far more economical of materials, and could be conveniently vaulted to carry on every story a stone floor, thus getting rid of the peril from fire involved in the old Norman planking. Wood, however, continued to provide the material for the most important part of the armament of these round keeps. This was the *bretache*, or covered wooden gallery, which ran round the top of the tower, from which every sort of missile was hurled on the besiegers. It was supported by wooden struts resting on stone corbels, and had a sloping roof. A portion of this crucial defence has actually been preserved at Coucy,

in France, built about 1225 by the Sieur Enguerrand III. No such remains exist in England, though Norham preserves one of the doorways giving access to the bretache.

Much was done in this reign to render the castle habitable.

**The Growth of  
Domestic  
Architecture.**

Various conveniences were introduced or amended. The old Norman hearth—a mere recess connected with a smoke-vent—was supplanted by the regular fireplace. The wide ingles were adorned with elegant hoods of stone, and flues were built in the castle walls. The spread of luxury, of which the Court of Henry III. set the example, was, in fact, tending to revolutionize all English life. The nobles began to find residence in the rude fortalices of their fathers irksome, and, in the case of the smaller baronage, who were quite unable to garrison them, such residence was futile also. It was obviously absurd to inhabit, under circumstances of great discomfort, a fortress strong enough to keep an army at bay, when all that was required was a house which could resist the importunity of a robber or a neighbour. This feeling was all against the castle and in favour of the manor-house; and we have positive proof, in the numerous permits to fortify (*licentiæ kernellare*) granted by the king, that the fortified manor-house was all the fashion.

Nevertheless of lay, as distinguished from military and ecclesiastical, architecture, the specimens that have come down to us are comparatively few. Poor folk would still live in their wooden houses, and they of course have disappeared. But the new manor-houses seem to have been superior to those with which the Norman was content, and which have survived to fulfil the humble uses of a barn or a homestead. The new houses were comfortable enough to make it worth while for later owners to inhabit, and in time to alter them out of all recognition. Anyhow, Early English houses of this class are quite as rare as those in the Norman period. Among the most perfect specimens are the manor-houses of Cottesford and Cogges, which seem to belong to the earlier part of the reign; and Aydon Hall in Northumberland, Stokesay in Shropshire, Woodcroft and Longthorp in Northamptonshire, Little Wenham Hall in Suffolk, and Flore's House, Oakham, which are of somewhat later date.

Two most important buildings, which are neither churches

1273]

nor fortresses nor ordinary residences, remain to be noticed. These are the King's Hall at Winchester and the Bishop's Palace at Wells; and they show very clearly that the lay architects followed, but followed slowly, the changes introduced by the free masons of the Early English cathedrals. The King's Hall has undergone many alterations and many restorations; but at the west end we come upon the early lancets of the original building, completely separate outwardly, but on the inside deeply splayed and grouped together by a moulding. These are not later than 1235, while the window inserted in the side wall, shortly before the accession of Edward, exhibits a simple form of plate-tracery. This is a genuine two-light window, so appearing both on the inside and outside of the building, each light being trefoil-headed, with a dividing transom and a quatrefoil above, the whole enclosed by a moulding. The episcopal palace at Wells looks later than the older part of the hall at Winchester; but probably it is not so in reality, for it was built by Bishop Joscelyn, who was promoted to the See in 1205, and the architects at Wells were a little in advance of those of the rest of England. Here we have the ground floor, used for domestic purposes, and storerooms lighted by single lancets, while the story above, where were the dwelling apartments of the bishop, has excellent double trefoiled lights, with a quatrefoil in the head and marble shafts at the sides. The lay architects, as a rule, showed little originality; and even in constructing prison chambers, like the vaulted rooms at Somerton, in the Tower of London, and Lincoln Castle, the imitation of the cathedral architecture is very striking, even to the use of the central pillar, universal in the round or hexagonal chapter-house of this reign.

This reign was remarkable for a strenuous effort to reform the coinage. More than one proclamation was issued against money which was not round, the royal anger being directed, not only against the obviously felonious practice of clipping, but against the humble habit of making change for a penny by chopping it into halfpence and farthings. The penny in silver continued, as in former reigns, to be the usual coin of commerce, though halfpence and farthings were issued; and there is some reason to believe that a groat was coined with a long cross reaching

Coins.



to the edge as a precaution against the malpractices of the Jews. The old patterns were in use in the early part of the reign, but in 1247, at any rate, a new coinage was undertaken. From the point of view of art the coin-maker of the period was still behind his Saxon forerunners. A rude attempt at a portrait is attempted, but it looks rather like a feeble repetition of the no less rude image of the king's grandfather. Henry was, however, the first of the Norman or Angevin princes who ventured on adding a number to his title, and the appearance of the Roman numeral III., or sometimes the word *Terci*, suggests that he was inclined to consider the age of his dynasty worth mentioning. The most remarkable numismatic event of the reign was, however, the abortive attempt to introduce a gold coinage. Up to the middle of the thirteenth century Western Europe had found the Byzants, of the Cæsars of Rome by the Bosphorus, helped out by an occasional dinar of a Saracen Prince, sufficient for all its needs in the way of a gold medium. In that year, however, a gold penny was issued in London by Henry III. On one side the king crowned is sitting on a chair of state, a sceptre in his right hand, and an orb in his left. The reverse shows a long double cross, and a rose with pellets in the angles. The gold in these coins is the purest that has ever been employed in our national coinage, a circumstance which has, no doubt, largely contributed to its disappearance. It was not a very beautiful coin, but more neatly executed than the contemporary silver. It was not, however, received with favour, probably because of its excessive value. The exchange was fixed at twenty silver pennies, and in purchasing value, according to our modern prices, it was probably worth several pounds. It was not long generally current, for the citizens of London petitioned against it, and it was accordingly redeemed by the king. It did not, however, pass entirely out of use, though no doubt mostly found in the royal exchequer, for in 1265, the famous year of Evesham, it was raised by proclamation to the value of twenty-four pennies. The coin is exceedingly rare, and the authentic specimens may probably be counted on the fingers of one hand.



THE University of Oxford may be said to have come into existence so soon as the brotherhood of Masters assumed something of a formal shape, and prescribed some sort of routine in study and ceremonial; for instance, to take the example from Paris, in frequenting lectures and disputations, in wearing a scholar's cap, and in attending the funerals of other members of the body. But, unlike Paris, Oxford had no Cathedral Chancellor to give the licence to teach, which, we have seen, was an essential element in the scholar's recognition by his elders. It became necessary to invent an analogous officer, and, as a matter of course, he was connected with the see of Lincoln, in which diocese Oxford was then situated. The circumstances in which he was appointed are characteristic of the tumultuous life of the mediæval students. In 1208, a murder committed by one of the Arts students led to reprisals on the part of the townsmen. King John, it was understood, favoured the latter, and the scholars—we are told, three thousand in number—resolved to quit the place. At the beginning of 1209 Oxford was emptied. The town soon awoke to the loss it had suffered, and when a Papal Legate arrived in England in 1213 it was not sorry to purchase the hope of restoration by an ample penance. In the ordinance regulating this penance mention is made of "the Chancellor whom the Bishop of Lincoln shall set over the scholars;" and when the office is actually established it is that of the Bishop's representative, conferring the licence and exercising judicial authority over the Masters and scholars of the University. Yet it is probable that from the first the Chancellor was elected by the Masters and only confirmed by the Bishop: so that, instead of there arising, as at Paris, a constant struggle between the Chancellor and the University, at Oxford he was by a natural process absorbed into the academic body. He presided over the Congregation of the University, but his jurisdiction in substance passed to the Congregation itself.

R. L. POOLE.  
Learning and  
Science.

The University of  
Oxford.

The Chancellor.

Early in the second quarter of the thirteenth century Oxford borrowed another constitutional feature from Paris, where the Masters of Arts were divided into four nations, French, English, Norman, and Picard,

The Proctors.

each with its representative, or Proctor (Procurator), to act on behalf of the Masters when it was necessary to defend their rights. At Oxford there were but two nations, the Northern and the Southern, and hence there were, and are, but two Proctors. By this organisation, and in consequence of their numerical strength, the "Artists" succeeded in engrossing the real power in the University and leaving the higher Faculties of Theology, Law, and Medicine little besides the dignity of precedence. But it would be out of place here to examine at length the constitutional history of Oxford. It may be sufficient to notice that the first recorded Statute dates from 1252.

In spite, however, of the growing stability of the University, it was long before it could be said to be definitely fixed at Oxford. We have seen how a general migration took place in 1208. In 1240 a number of the Oxford clerks removed themselves to Cambridge, where the sister University had sprung up in the first years of the century. A little later Cambridge, too, suffered a dispersion, which went near to establishing a third university at Northampton. Here, in 1264, the young school was recruited by the mass of the Oxford scholars, who, after a great conflict with the townsmen, feared with reason that their privileges would be cut short. At Northampton, when, just afterwards, King Henry III. besieged the place, the Oxford scholars were foremost with their slings and bows, and were only reduced to a timid neutrality by the king's oath that he would hang every man of them. It was not until the victory of Simon of Montfort—for politics had a good deal to do with the Oxford riot—that the scholars were enjoined to return. Even so late as 1334 there was so considerable a secession to Stamford that fears were felt for the very existence of the University, and strong measures were taken to stamp out the schism. So long, indeed, as the students lived as they pleased in lodgings or grouped themselves round a Master in his private house, there was no certainty that the University would remain fixed in one place. The academical stability of Oxford and Cambridge was determined by the rise of the colleges, and the colleges, though the idea was borrowed from the University of Paris, arose under the stimulating example of the Mendicant Friars.

---

1273]

In order to understand the distinguishing characteristics of these new brotherhoods, we must bear in mind that at the time of their foundation there were in Latin Christendom two classes, and two only, of persons professing a religious rule: the Monks, who followed the Rule of St. Benet; and the Canons, who followed that bearing the name of St. Austin. Cluniacs, Carthusians, and Cistercians, were alike in essence Benedictines; Regular Canons and Præmonstratensians were alike Augustinians. Now the Lateran Council of 1215 expressly prohibited the foundation of any new Order. St. Francis had, it is true, a few years earlier, in 1209, obtained Innocent III.'s approval of his missionary aims; but the scheme was too inchoate for formal confirmation. St. Dominic was in Rome at the time of the Council; and he, when he sought the Pope's authorisation of his preaching brotherhood, was bidden to choose the rules of one of the existing orders to conform it to. He chose, therefore, to remain what he was himself, an Augustinian canon; and from the Augustinian canons the Friars Preachers are lineally descended. The Franciscans, on the other hand, or Friars Minor, preserved their freedom, and only after many changes of government adopted a code of constitutions, in which the influence of the Dominican rule is strongly marked.

**The Friars.**

The two new orders are distinguished from their predecessors in several ways. The brethren were not bound to continue in the religious house where they were professed. They were not burthened with the duty of manual labour in the fields. Above all, they were to live on alms—they were Mendicants. And this leads to another point of distinction of the highest importance. If they were to depend for their bodily support on the gifts of others, their lives must be devoted to the service of others; and this, in fact, was the profession of both orders. They were in principle missionaries, but with a difference: the Dominicans applied themselves to the work of opposing heresy and error, and of bringing over the heathen to the true faith; while the Franciscans sought with a more directly personal aim to revive the life of Christ and his apostles. But the distinction of precept and example was not long maintained in practice. The Franciscans, it is true, were conspicuous in the mission they found of carrying the

**The Friars and the Universities.**

civilising influences of Christianity among the neglected populations of the towns; but they too, although their founder's example was firm against worldly studies, soon became teachers, and a long and mainly honourable rivalry arose between Friars Preachers and Friars Minor, which should hold the place of pre-eminence in learning and in the schools—a rivalry that lasted until the transition into modern times. The Franciscans extended their connexion in a wide circle by the recognition of Tertiaries, or half-members of their Order, who lived in the world and only observed the rule with modifications. Two other societies were formed or reorganised about the same time; and both, the Carmelites and the Augustinian Hermits, adopted the Franciscan constitution before the middle of the thirteenth century. These were known as the White Friars and the Austin Friars.

The Friars Preachers were the first to come to England. This was in 1220, and their first house was established at Oxford. The Franciscans followed them in 1224, and they at once found their way to Oxford; in the same year they settled at Cambridge. The choice was a natural one; for not only did a university town offer a large field, in its mixed population, for their missionary labours, but it also promised a goodly harvest of recruits to be gathered from among the students. Besides, as we have said, to the Dominicans learning was a matter of obligation. Their younger members were instructed in philosophy before they entered upon the theological training which was required of all those in the Oxford convent who had not already been admitted to degrees in the Faculty. But the rules alike of the Dominicans and Franciscans forbade a Friar, after his profession, to take a degree in Arts. Consequently, when the University made such a degree the necessary preliminary to a degree in Theology, the Friars were in danger of losing the chief academic privileges altogether; and it was only after a struggle which came to a head in the early years of the fourteenth century that a practical compromise was arranged, whereby, while the University upheld its rule, it was permitted by grace to dispense from it sufficiently trained candidates presented to the Chancellor by their respective Orders.

At the first the Friars, probably from necessity, appointed

1273]

their teachers from outside. The first Lector of the Oxford Franciscans was Robert Grosseteste, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, one of the most famous men of learning of the century, and his three successors likewise belonged to the secular clergy. But soon the school had teachers of its own, and Friars were lecturers also in the convents of Cambridge, Bristol, Hereford, and Leicester. They were, indeed, more than able to hold their own in the contests of the schools and in independent advancement of knowledge; though this, in the case of the Franciscans, was a defiance of their founder's injunctions. It was impossible for them to possess any books or scientific instruments, and Roger Bacon could only obtain ink and parchment by the special leave of the Pope. Nevertheless, their care for the poor led them constantly into connexion with sickness and disease, and a knowledge of medicine became for them a necessity. Medical involved physical studies, and the great mass of Franciscan scholars whatever their eminence in other branches of learning, were distinguished also by their acquirements in physical science. The original rule of the Order could not be maintained; some sort of possessions the Friars must have, and the "moderate use" of worldly goods which Pope Nicolas the Third, in 1279, allowed them was happily ambiguous in practice. The widened range of knowledge which they brought into play in turn reacted upon their secular brethren; and even when the force of the scholastic movement was spent, and academical studies were far on their decline, we may still observe that the influence of their example was not wholly forgotten, and a varied course of training in mathematics, natural philosophy, and natural science, was still pursued by those who aimed at rank among scholars.

It would be unfair to judge the Friars alone by their learned work. If many of them were great scholars, more were also great preachers; indeed, their learning was designed to prepare them for their life of activity among the people. They were the most popular of preachers; and their sermons told with a direct force that sprang from the spiritual earnestness not less than from the theological completeness of the preacher's equipment, and was brought home by his plain language, his humorous touches, and his good stories. By a sharp and not unnatural contrast the severity of the Friar's

profession was balanced by a light-hearted temper and a merry countenance. He had the repute everywhere of a pleasant fellow. To those who read the accounts of the early years of the Franciscans, the warmth of their reception and the rapidity of their conquests are easy to be understood. Nor was it otherwise with the Dominicans, although, great as is the part they play in the history of English learning, they never filled the same place in the minds of Englishmen at large as did their Franciscan rivals.

The Friars' distinction in the schools of Oxford and Cambridge acted as a spur to their secular rivals, who could not but observe how their zeal and method in study was assisted by

**The Collegiate System.**

their manner of life. They dwelt in houses or convents of their own, and the convents formed each a miniature *studium* in the midst of the greater academic body of the place. The advantages of this common, regulated life were manifest, and it was natural to seek to adapt the system to the requirements of those who had no mind to attach themselves to a lasting rule. The first specimen of such an adaptation was perhaps that of John Balliol and Dervorguilla his wife, not long after 1260; but their endowment, modelled on the

**The House of Balliol.**

example of the earliest colleges at Paris, constituted at the outset a mere almshouse for a few poor students. The first real beginning of the Collegiate system, the archetype of the colleges both of Oxford and Cambridge, was made by the foundation of Walter of Merton, Chancellor and afterwards Bishop of Rochester, which he established in 1264, and planted definitely at Oxford ten years later.

Merton College consisted of a Warden and a certain number of Scholars, who lived together in

**Merton College.**

conventual buildings designed on a grand plan. The Scholars were to engage themselves in the study of Arts, and then proceed to Theology, a few being allowed the choice of Canon or Civil Law. If anyone received an ecclesiastical benefice or entered a religious Order, he at once lost his Scholarship. Otherwise he remained a Scholar or Fellow (the names are used interchangeably) so long as he resided in the College. The elder Scholars were largely employed in College business, in keeping the household accounts, and overseeing the estates. All dined and supped



1273]

in the common refectory; they were bound to keep the canonical hours and hear Mass in the College chapel. But, four Chaplains being provided, they were under no obligation to enter Holy Orders themselves. The foundation further supplied a number (up to thirteen) of "poor boys" with a maintenance and education until they were old enough to become Scholars.

Walter of Merton's scheme was taken as a model, though with variations in detail, by the founders of later Colleges; and through their establishment neither Oxford nor Cambridge was in serious danger of ceasing to be the home of a university. But it would be altogether a mistake to suppose that the colleges occupied anything like the dominant position which they acquired in later times. By far the majority of students throughout the middle ages lived either in lodgings by themselves or in halls or inns managed by graduates. The Non-Collegiate Student of the present day represents not merely the earliest but the normal type of the English university student; and it was not until the fifteenth century that the lodging-house system was checked, and not until the reign of Charles the First that the Colleges succeeded in engrossing the entire government, and absorbing nearly the entire population, of the University. It is plain that when Oxford counted several, if not many, thousand scholars, but a very small proportion could find room in the four Colleges of the thirteenth century, or even the nine Colleges of the fourteenth, each with an average number of at most thirty or forty members. The life of the student was then less formal and less regulated; such uniformity as there was was obtained rather by the system of study than by any strict rules of discipline.

The methods of study had, indeed, undergone a revolution since the time when John of Salisbury learned at Paris or Chartres; and this revolution was due **University Studies.** first to the introduction of new dialectical appliances from the Byzantine school of logicians, and secondly to the opening out of the whole works of Aristotle to the western world. We have seen that in John's own lifetime all the books of the *Organon* were already known, but they passed but slowly into the educational system, and St. Edmund Rich, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, is claimed as the first to lecture on the last book—the *Sophistici Elenchi*—at Oxford, in the third decade of the thirteenth century. The knowledge of Aristotle's complete



logical exposition only excited the desire for further teaching as to the metaphysical questions arising about the basis of logic. The desired information was found in other works of Aristotle which were made accessible in Latin by the beginning of the thirteenth century. The translations were taken in some cases from the Greek originals, in others from Arabic versions, themselves made indirectly from the Greek by the vehicle of Hebrew or Syriac translations. But in one way or the other the whole of Aristotle was now in the hands of Western scholars, and the effect upon the method and even the subject matter of their philosophical studies was prodigious. Instead of moving within the circumscribed field to which their previously existing materials confined them, they now found a new world of speculation ready for them to explore, the very crabbedness and ambiguity of the translations supplying ever fresh openings for nimble invention, for fine distinctions, for originality. For if, viewed absolutely, originality is not to be asserted of the productions of scholastic thought, nevertheless, in relation to the philosophers and their times, there is a fertility of original conceptions, and with it a subtilty of manipulation, which only suffered from the ease with which it might degenerate into legerdemain.

With Aristotle Western scholars became acquainted also with the commentaries of the Arab doctors Avicenna (Ibn Sîna, died 1037) and Averrôes (Ibn Rushd, died 1198), and their teaching might seem inevitably tainted by its Mohammedan source.

**The Study of  
Aristotle.**

Moreover, some were led, by the study of the *Physics* of Aristotle, to conclusions the heretical character of which was so manifest that in 1209 the work itself was forbidden to be read at Paris. Six years later the proscription was extended to the *Metaphysics*, and it was not until 1231 that the Greek philosopher received a qualified toleration in that university. The diversity of treatment applicable to the same material, as seen in the Arab commentators, could not but produce an uncertainty about positive truth; and while some wandered away into scepticism, most were glad to correct the indecision of human reason by enforcing the absolute and sole authority of an unerring revelation. The British philosopher, John Duns Scotus (died 1308), who represents the extreme of this tendency, maintained that there was no true knowledge of

1273]

anything knowable apart from revelation ; we could not of ourselves prove the existence of a God. The Italian, St. Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274), on the other hand, while admitting that some truths were beyond the discernment of human reason, sought to effect a harmony of reason and faith by positing reason and revelation as two independent sources of knowledge, each sufficient in its own plan of action. Whether the final conclusions of the Arab philosophers were accepted or not in full, the influence of their method was long paramount. While the German, St. Albert the Great (1193-1280), held by Avicenna, and Aquinas followed Averröes, they decided alike that the Mohammedan superstructure was faulty, and that recourse must be had in the end, as in the beginning, to the Aristotelian foundation. It was hence that Aquinas promoted the execution of a new translation of Aristotle, which was made by William of Moerbeke shortly before the saint's death.

The renown of Albert and Thomas made the authority of Aristotle at once the guiding one for their Order, the Dominican. The Franciscans, on the other hand, held for a time fast by the Platonic tradition as it had passed to them from St. Austin. But it was impossible for them to remain long untouched by the influence which had won so powerful a currency through the teaching of their rivals, and even Alexander of Hales (died 1245), senior in years to Albert, was profoundly affected by it. The questions at issue involved the nicest problems of psychology, and it would be impossible here, without a technical discussion unsuited to the character of this book, even to sketch their purport. It must suffice to notice that the new studies raised difficulties about the immortality of the soul, which the hardy inquirer was apt to solve by a pantheistic or a materialistic theory ; and Aquinas himself was charged with erroneous doctrine, which was condemned by the Bishop of Paris in 1277. At Oxford also a like controversy was dealt with in the same way by two successive Friar Archbishops of Canterbury—the Dominican Kilwardby and the Franciscan Peckham.

Among the leading masters in the English scholasticism of the thirteenth century Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, claims a foremost place. He was already a prominent man in the University of Oxford when, early in the second quarter of the

Grosseteste as  
Scholar.

century, he was called upon, though a secular, to preside over the Franciscan school there; and when he became bishop of the diocese within which Oxford lay, his moderating and enlightening influence was constantly felt in the University as in the nation at large during the many years which followed until his death in 1253. But his personal authority was less than that which he wielded as a writer, and this authority continued until beyond the end of the middle ages. He commented upon Aristotle, wrote philosophical treatises as well as works on physical science. Poems in French and set treatises on theology indicate the breadth of his intellectual training; and when it is added that he was skilled in medicine and in music, and credited with a knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, it will be seen that his acquirements might easily pass as unrivalled in his age.

His younger contemporary, Adam Marsh, lecturer also at the Franciscan school at Oxford, was more famous as a teacher

**Adam Marsh.** and organiser of teaching than as himself an author, though his works (now lost, excepting

his letters) are said to have borne out his character as a worthy successor to the all-accomplished Bishop of Lincoln. His record lies rather in the school which, more than any other, he brought to maturity—the school whence issued Roger Bacon, John Duns Scotus, and William of Ockham. Roger Bacon, it needs not

**Roger Bacon.** be said, stands quite by himself—not by any means because he limited himself to the physical studies by which in modern times he is renowned, but because, having learned all that could be learned of the current philosophy, scholarship, science, and literature of his day, knowing Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic, and having advanced in some directions far beyond the limit of performance then deemed possible, he was able to judge the existing state of knowledge, and apportion its excellences and its defects from a point of view immeasurably more independent than any other man. He is not merely the original investigator and discoverer of physical truths, but the wisest critic of the learning of his age. He seems to have felt that the scholastic method had already run its course by the years 1267–1271, in which he completed his principal works, and that it was time that new lines of inquiry should be pursued in the directions of physical science and philology.

1273]

Duns Scotus, partly in order to liberate his Order from the philosophical ascendancy of the Dominicans, partly in a reaction from the overpowering weight of Aristotle's authority, reverted to an uncompromising Realism. But his chief service is that by his unmatched logical faculty he was able to erect a battery of criticism against the dominant school of thought which saved it from the perils of absolutism. The controversies for the moment cleared the air and gave room for reflexion. In theology, while substituting an intellectual for an ethical conception of God, Duns ran dangerously near Pantheism, and asserted the doctrine of free-will in such a way that recourse was necessary to revelation for its correction; he also headed the Franciscans in their defence of the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin, which had been steadily opposed by Aquinas and the Dominicans. With Duns, logic had been the subtlest and most powerful of instruments; his pupil (as is commonly said), William of Ockham, proposed for it higher claims still, and he revived in a maturer form the Nominalism of the twelfth century. Universal ideas were to him the mere arbitrary creations of the mind. But in theology and ethics the impress of Duns's teaching was lasting with him; in matters of faith, indeed, he continued orthodox, but the whole character of his doctrine was essentially sceptical. It is not strange that the new Nominalism took firm root among the critical spirits of the University of Paris and flourished there for many generations.

Duns Scotus.

If the British Islands had produced Alexander of Hales and Roger Bacon among the great names of the thirteenth century, and John Duns Scotus and William of Ockham, the greatest at the opening of the fourteenth—all Franciscans,—the attractive forces of Paris were too strong for them not to seek there a more public and ambitious field of study and teaching than they could find in England. Bacon alone returned to Oxford; the rest are numbered among the foremost doctors of Paris. Yet Duns's famous commentary on the *Sentences* bears by an old tradition the title of *Scriptum Oxoniense*, so that he may be fairly claimed to have accomplished a weighty part of his work as teacher and writer before he left England. Far from dying, as is commonly said, at the age of thirty-four, he was fully that age when

he departed for Paris in 1304, and he died as lecturer at Cologne four years later. Ockham is related to have been a pupil of

William of  
Ockham.

Duns, in all probability at Paris, since he lived on at least until 1349: certainly it was at Paris that he made his reputation as a logician.

His after history, as the champion of the Emperor Lewis IV. in his contest with Pope John XXII., illustrates the application of the principles of a sceptical logic to the solution of political questions. To give power to the secular authority he holds better than to give it to the ecclesiastical; but this is mainly because the Church, in Ockham's view, should be kept pure from worldly affairs, not because he has any confidence in the abstract fitness of the civil state. The decision in matters of faith he would entrust, not to the Pope, but to general councils formed alike of clergy and lay folk; but these, too, he admits may err, and in despair of human infallibility he is obliged to revert to the old doctrine of the authority of the Holy Scriptures. Still, though Ockham's conclusions are hesitating, his great political treatise, the *Dialogue*, marks an important stage in the history of political theory, even as his *Sum of Logic* marks a revolution in that of dialectic. From Ockham onwards, though in one or two points there is an advance in logical manipulation, and though there are still a few great names, such as those of Archbishop Bradwardine and Walter Burleigh, generally it is a period of steady decline; and the schools busied themselves with the weaving afresh of old stuffs until there was no fabric left, and thought became entangled in the mass of words until it was well-nigh hopeless to unravel it. The educational system was labouring under a congestion which needed the drastic remedies it received from the Humanists of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

THOUGH the English race, and in consequence their language and literature, had been forced to yield up

H. FRANK HEATH.  
Language and  
Literature.

supremacy—and almost existence—to the Normans during the preceding century and a half, this was not destined to last. The conquerors were too weak in numbers, the conquered too sturdy in character and physique, to make extinction or even permanent servitude

1273]

possible, and the inevitable result was a slow but certain fusing of the two elements. This process was greatly aided by the course of political events during Henry III.'s reign. The tyranny and administrative weakness of the Crown led to rebellion among the barons; but ultimate success was reserved to the side which could win the support of the English yeomen and labourers. This support the barons succeeded in obtaining, partly because constant and closer contact with their tenants gave them a personal influence which quite outweighed the theoretical authority of the Crown, partly because any opposition to the Court seemed to open out to the English a prospect of revenge upon the hated Norman conqueror. And so, after many preliminary squabbles and peacemakings, followed by open war, a decisive check was given to the royal prerogative by the barons and their English allies, all of which resulted in the beginnings of our present parliamentary government and the disappearance of the old racial antipathies and opposing interests. Then it was that the national spirit became once more conscious of itself and its powers, and began again to find its expression in literature.

We find, therefore, that the relative position of the three languages which occupied the social field changes somewhat during the period now <sup>Norman French, Latin, and English.</sup> under consideration. For the previous hundred and fifty years Anglo-Norman had been the speech of all who made the slightest pretence to position or culture, and naturally of all the literature produced for them. Latin was the universal language of the learned, of the law, and of the Church, and English was only spoken by the yeomen and lower orders, and written in the very small body of literature which sufficed for their needs. In 1154 the last of the English annals, those compiled at Peterborough, were closed; and from then till the second quarter of the thirteenth century English found its almost exclusive use in the religious literature produced for the edification of the masses.

Soon after the accession of Henry III., however, things began to change. In consequence of the loss of Normandy, just eleven years before this date, the barons were forced to look upon England as their only home, and to seek their pleasures and interests here, so the Anglo-Norman dialect naturally began to die out as the language of home-life,



though it kept its place at Court and in the law. But even at Court it gradually gave place to Central French, from which it was so different that English soldiers found it difficult during the French wars to understand their foes, and the sons of nobles were often sent to France to learn what was considered the more aristocratic way of speech.\* French remained the language of the Court till the end of the next century, and Anglo-Norman was the language of government and law until within fifty years of that time, for it was not till 1362 that cases began to be tried, or the proceedings of Parliament held, in English. It is noticeable, however, that during the whole of Henry III.'s reign, and for some little time longer, all reports of law cases were written in Latin, and it is not till the next century that French was used side by side with it for this purpose. In the administrative departments also Latin was used almost exclusively till the middle of the thirteenth century, and English was not used as a rule till the third decade of the fifteenth century. There are instances of the use of both French and English earlier than these dates, such as a French document of Stephen Langton's, issued 1215, and Henry III.'s famous proclamation of 1258, which made use of English and French side by side; or again, in a royal proclamation at Worcester in 1299 (*Annales Monastici*, IV., 541), or in a document granting privileges to the City of London, dated 1327, both in English; but these are only isolated cases, and at most point to a growing interest of the Government in the English-born section of the people—or, rather, to their growing wealth and influence.

About private documents in this century we have unfortunately no evidence; but that they were probably always written in Latin we may infer from the fact that the Countess of Stafford, making her will in 1438, thought it necessary to explain why she made it in English (*Halliwell*, Dic. I p. x. note). On the other hand, Anglo-Norman was naturally the

\* Cf. Gervasius of Tilbury, *Otia Imperialia* c. xx. l. 13 seq. in Leibnitz's *Scriptores Rerum Brunsvicensium* I., p. 945, where he is speaking of his own time. The chief peculiarities of A.-N. were :—The dropping of inflections and unaccented vowels in all parts of the word; the pronunciation of *ñ* as *n* and *û* as *u*; the introduction of English words, etc., as we see from such comic pieces as the "Fabliau de deux Angloys et de l'anel," "La pais aus Englois" (cf. Wright, *Political Songs*), and others.



1273]

language in which the education of the upper classes was conducted. They were educated either at home or in the house of some abbot or bishop, or sometimes, as we have seen, in France. It can hardly be doubted, however, that English was used at least as much as Anglo-Norman in the cathedral-, abbey-, and grammar-schools, for the sons of the commoners were most unlikely to have learnt anything but English at home. At the universities, of course, Latin reigned supreme. To sum up, then, we see that Latin and Anglo-Norman hold their own in university, public, and Court life to the end of our present period and beyond it, though there is a tendency noticeable for the latter to infringe upon the former in legal and other documents. In private life, however, and in literature, as we shall see, English is beginning to regain lost ground at the expense of Anglo-Norman.

At the same time, it was inevitable that this English should be much modified in form by constant contact with the French dialect spoken on all sides, and we find in consequence that the language of such a writer as Robert of Gloucester, who flourished at the end of the thirteenth century, is something very different from that written just before the Conquest, or even from that of Layamon, who though living at the beginning of the century, was distinctly archaic in tendency. As has been remarked, the first effect of the Norman Conquest was a negative one, leading to a fresh splitting up of English into a number of dialects, of which the main divisions are Northern, East and West Midland, and Southern. The last was spoken south of a line coinciding with the Thames as far west as Oxford and thence over Evesham and Worcester to the Severn. The first include Yorkshire, Northumberland, Durham, and the Scotch lowlands. All who lived between these two districts spoke Midland. It was not till the beginning of the fourteenth century that any very large number of Romance words was adopted into English, but from 1200 onwards Anglo-Norman words were slowly being absorbed, especially in connection with ecclesiastical ideas and those of general culture. Later came words connected with the State, knighthood, dress, hunting, the castle and the kitchen, for which there had either been no English words, or they had fallen out of use during the period

**Changes in  
English.**

of degradation following the Conquest. In some cases doublets were the result, such as *work* and *labour*.

It must be remembered, of course, that these borrowed words did not retain their native form, but in most cases suffered more or less modification, especially in the position of the accent, which was in time thrown back upon the first syllable, in accordance with the English principle. This, combined with the fact that the English accent was a much stronger one than the French, led in time to the weakening of the unaccented syllable, thus:—Anglo-Norman, *resoûn* > M. E., *resoûn* > and then later *réson* > Modern English, *réason* (pronounced reezn). It was not, however, till the sixteenth century that there was any uniformity in this matter, the borrowed words being capable of bearing either Romance or English accent during the M. E. period. Meanwhile, native words were undergoing important modifications. There was a tendency before 1250 to lengthen the quantity of all monosyllables ending in a consonant and of all vowels standing before the combinations *mb*, *nd*, *ld*, and *ng*,\* while long vowels before a lengthened consonant were shortened. After 1250 short vowels were lengthened if they stood at the end of an unaccented syllable—e.g., *brȳ-ken* > *brȳ-ken*. The changes in quality are no less marked. The O. E. diphthongs (e.g.) became monophthongs—though much more slowly in the South than in the Midlands and the North—and a new set of what are called “secondary diphthongs” appeared, due to the combination of a primary vowel with a vowel developed from an original consonant: thus—O. E., *dæg* > M. E., *dai* or *day*. This naturally leads us to notice that some of the consonants, at least, underwent a change. The O. E. gutturals were palatalised: e.g., O. E. *læccēan* > M. E. *lacchen*=Mn. E. *latch*; and O. E. palatals often disappeared altogether, especially in weak syllables, or were vocalised and combined with other vowels to form fresh diphthongs, as described above. The initial sounds found in the words “chief” and “joy” were borrowed from Anglo-Norman. Finally, we must notice the gradual disappearance of inflections, due to weakening of the vowels in final unaccented syllables. This, in turn, affected the syntax of the

\* This was known to the Anglian and late W. Saxon dialects before the Conquest.

1273]

language, making necessary a more logical arrangement of words in the sentence.

When we turn to the literature we find, as would be expected from what has been said, that most of the work produced during the first half of the reign is written in Latin; and the most important books fall under the head of history. The long line of chronicle and history writers in the twelfth century is continued into this, and culminates in Matthew Paris. A great advance is noticeable in this kind of writing in the thirteenth century. Chronicles give way to histories, chronological accounts of a string of events give place to a method of presentation which attempts to connect events with their causes, to estimate and to pass a judgment upon the characters of the chief actors, and to trace out the tendency of their actions. The famous northern school of chroniclers of the twelfth century came to an end with Roger Hoveden (d. circa. 1201) the greatest of them all. The centre of this form of literary activity then moved southwards to St. Albans, a town most favourably situated for obtaining information, being on the great north road, and within an easy stage of the capital. Here lived during the thirteenth century a series of monks who produced most valuable historical work.

Literature.

The Development  
of Historical  
Writing.

The first was the compiler of a chronicle afterwards made much use of by his successors, Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris. Dr. Luard has shown with a fair amount of certainty that this writer is to be identified with John de Cella, who was abbot, 1189–1214. On this compilation, which has no historic value and accepts all sources of information as equally valuable, Roger of Wendover (d. 1236) founded the first part of his “*Flores Historiarum*.” He re-wrote and enlarged his original up to 1231, copied it verbatim to 1012, then introduced a few alterations to 1065, from which year he again copied closely with occasional additions to the year 1188, where his own work begins. Even here its historical value is of the slightest—at any rate in regard to the amount of discrimination shown in weighing evidence. Wendover is, however, anxious to be impartial and, except where the interests of his order are concerned, succeeds fairly well. He is laudably outspoken in his criticism of all orders

of men, and chronicles their deeds in a plain, straightforward style, which lacks all distinctive character.

His successor, Matthew Paris (b. circa 1200, d. 1259), who in spite of his name, was of English origin, showed great advance in his work upon that of the Northern school and that done before him at St. Albans. He was not only an historian, but a traveller, politician, and, most difficult of all, a courtier to boot. The first portion of his work, the "*Historia Major*," like that of Wendover, was transcribed with a few alterations from the compilation by John de Cella, and when this source of information ceased, he used the "*Flores Historiarum*" up to the year 1235, but with very considerable alterations from 1199 onwards. A condensed form of this earlier portion of the "*Historia Major*" afterwards formed the first part of a compilation going under the name of Matthew of Westminster. From 1235 to 1250, where the first edition ended, the work is original. Subsequently the work was revised and extended to 1253, and an abridgment made under the title "*Historia Anglorum*" or "*Historia Minor*." Finally, at the close of his life the author added a further continuation to 1259 which he never revised. Matthew Paris is among the very best of mediæval historians. His style is vivid and picturesque, and his book gives us a series of brilliant criticisms on the men and events of his time. He is honest in purpose, a lover of truth, a keen observer, and, on the whole, just, though occasionally he gives vent to violent expressions when he feels ecclesiastical interests are at stake. He is practically the only authority for the years of Henry's reign between 1248 and 1253, and he shows much knowledge of contemporary affairs in the Empire, France, and Rome. He is, as a rule, quite trustworthy, far more so than the forerunners in his school. Where parallel authorities exist they bear out his truthfulness, and recent investigations have in every case confirmed it. He is even more fearless than Wendover in his outspoken blame of those who deserve it, no matter what their position in society. Even St. Louis is remonstrated with because he extorted money for his crusade from the Church of France. The picture he draws of the English king is very vivid; he paints him as a man weak in purpose, but brave in battle, passionate and unreliable,

1273]

avaricious; he calls him "regulus mendicans," and at the same time a spendthrift, devoted to foreign favourites. Towards the end of his life, when he had learnt to know him better personally,\* he began to think he had possibly been rather extravagant in some of his criticisms, and he revised his work, cutting out many a hard word about Henry and modifying others. He was a fearless critic and therefore not afraid to retract.

William Rishanger, whose "Cronica" extended from 1259 to 1306, was also a monk of St. Albans. He evidently made use of the same sources as Nicholas Trivet in his "Annales sex Regum Angliæ," etc., from which Chaucer drew his "Man of Lawe's Tale." Finally the monastic annals of Burton, Winchester, Waverley, Dunstable, and Worcester must not be forgotten. Those of Winchester give a very full contemporary account of the decade following the battle of Evesham, whilst those of Waverley afford a valuable supplement to Matthew Paris between 1219 and 1266.

When we turn to the English literature of this time we find that the productions of the first half of the reign are confined to religious and moral subjects. It is not till after the battle of Lewes that the rising national life finds its expression in literature as in politics. One of the first English works produced in this reign is a metrical version of a Latin "Physiologus" by Tebaldus, and called a "*Bestiary*" (between 1220 and 1230) in which the various animals with their mystical properties and symbolisms are described. The verse is very irregular; at one time short rimed couplets, at another short-lined stanzas with cross-rime, at another lines with alliteration and no rime. These latter seem used generally in the descriptive, the two former in the moralising passages. The metre, too, shows a curious mixture of the national and romance principles of structure. In the poetical version of "Genesis" produced not much later, and, like the "Orrmulum" and "*Bestiary*" in the East Midlands, romance influence is much more evident. The verse consists of short rimed couplets of regular construction, according to the French or syllabic principle. This invasion of even religious literature by foreign influences is only

Literature in  
English.

Poetry.

\* Henry III. was on a visit to St. Albans in 1257.

another sign of the advancing tide already noticed. The author's chief source is not the Bible but Petrus Comestor's "Historia Ecclesiastica" (written 1169–1175). In the same way another poet, perhaps of the same monastery, produced not long afterwards a metrical "Exodus" in the same style and based on the same source. Among the lyric poems of this time—several of which show the influence of the "Poema Morale,"\*—the "Luve Ron" (Love Roon) of Thomas de Hales deserves special mention for its richness of imagery and beauty of language. Into this department of poetry as elsewhere the complex musical measures of France were finding their way. Closely allied with the religious poetry is the proverbial. This kind of literature was naturally more conservative in form. Collections of proverbs under the name of Alfred and an imaginary wise man Hendyng were made and copied frequently during this reign, though the former can be traced back to the previous century. The "Owl and the Nightingale," written about 1220 in the south on the model of the Provençal "jeux partis" abounds with this proverbial philosophy. Although the poem is full of wisdom, the moral is not obtruded, as is the rule in mediæval work. The contending sides are balanced with wonderful skill, and the verse, which is the French short rimed couplet, is as smooth as any that Chaucer wrote. The owl is a humorous Puritan who represents old-fashioned manners and morals, and will know nothing of love and women, the themes which interest the graceful gay-hearted Philomel, who would like to refer the quarrel to a certain Nicholas of Guildford, one of the King's confidants. His decision is left to our imagination, though we may guess that it was not in the owl's favour.

In imitation of the "Owl and the Nightingale" a series of these "disputacions" sprang up, especially in the South, *e.g.*, "The Thrush and the Nightingale" in *rime couée*.† At the same time the taste for secular as opposed to religious erotic poetry grew, though the latter continued to be popular. The famous "Cuckoo's Song" (E. E. T. S., vii. 419), written in rimed septenars with refrain, and frequent alliteration and middle-rime, is an example of this growing fashion. The

\* Cf. Morris's "Old English Miscellany," pp. 192f, 195f.

† Or tail-rime: a stanza where some lines, usually the third and sixth, are shorter (*e.g.*, Chaucer's Rime of Sir Thopas).

1273]

English were fast beginning to take an interest in other things than the Church, and it was therefore no accident that the ballad written on the

Epic Poetry.

Victory of Lewes was in English instead of French or Latin, as such poems had always been hitherto. Remembering this we shall not be surprised to find shortly before the middle of the century the re-appearance of national epic. Truly "King Horn" and "Havelok the Dane" are in many ways better to be described as "Romans d'aventures" than as epic, and they have little enough in common with the dignified high heroic style of the Old English national epos. But the stories are native and based on historical fact, and their very plebeian tone, the truth with which they reflect the stubborn spirit of the down-trodden but unconquered English, makes them worthy of the higher title. Both Horn and Havelok are sons of kings, who suffer exile, and gradually work their way after many trials and adventures to their own again, with the reward of a royal and beautiful bride. But the story of Havelok is much more coarsely and realistically drawn, as befitted the hard-handed men of Lincolnshire for whom it was written. Were it not for its evident seriousness (its humour notwithstanding) it might be taken for a parody of "King Horn." The hero grows up as a fisher and scullery-boy instead of at the Court, and shows his worth by throwing a huge stone instead of splintering lances. "King Horn" was written before 1250, was intended to be sung,\* and is the only romance written in the same metre as Layamon's "Brut" and the "Proverbs of Alfred," viz., unequal strophes of short rimed couplets of four accents (male-ending) or three accents (female). "Havelok the Dane," on the other hand, is in rimed couplets of the French type, like the Anglo-Norman "Lai de Havelok" on which it is founded, and was meant to be recited, not sung. Banishment and ultimate return was a favourite theme with mediæval romances, and similar legends wove themselves round the names of Hereward the Wake, Fulk Fitz-Warin and others. The romances of Guy of Warwick, written in Kent, and Bevis of Hampton, a

Romance.

\* "Alle beon he blithe  
That to my song lythe:  
A sang ihe schal you singe  
Of Murry the kinge."—ll. i.-iv.



West Saxon poem, can only be mentioned by name. But the stories of every land were laid under contribution quite as eagerly as native legend.

"Amis and Amiloun" the Orestes and Pylades of Western romance, "Floris and Blancheflor" and "Sir Tristrem" are all taken from the French, the last being of Celtic origin. Both the latter are stories of love—but there all similarity ceases, the first being a tale of tender and innocent affection, the second of an all-mastering destroying passion. The English "Sir Tristrem" is chiefly interesting as showing the line of transition from the romance to the ballad, for the story is greatly compressed, and the verse consists of a stanza made up of four Alexandrines with middle and end rime, followed by a fifth of like construction connected with them by a line of one accent. But British and English stories were just as popular as Celtic or Oriental, and the romances of "Arthur and Merlin" and "Richard Cœur de Lion" were scarcely less popular than those of "Alisaunder," his eastern prototype, or Tristan and Isolde. Not only romances but fabliaux were borrowed from France, stories in which the chief interest lay in the action, not in the characters of the persons. In a romance the art lies in the method of presentation, in a fabliau the plot is in itself a work of art. Examples of this kind of art are "Dame Siriz," and "Reneuard and Sigrim" (taken from the Reynard Saga), the author of which is one of the finest of Chaucer's forerunners in the art of telling a tale. Others, such as "Orpheo," came originally from the East, but are deeply tinged with Celtic elements.

THE two most noticeable features of the agricultural history of the hundred and forty years of which the

W. J. CORBETT.  
Agriculture.

first portion is now to be described are the increasing pains which most landowners about the reign of Henry III. began to take in superintending and developing their estates, and the silent but steady change during the whole period in the position of the actual cultivators of the soil. The former of these is the easier to trace, but the latter the more important: for by it the great mass of the peasantry, from being serfs owing compulsory services to the lords of the manors where they had been born,

1273]

became converted into free labourers, earning daily wages, with power to work for whom and where they pleased. In the wake of this great revolution came eventually an entire change in the methods by which English agriculture was carried on, and the tenant-farmer for the first time comes upon the scene as an important and ordinary factor in village life. But though there are several instances of manors being let to farm in the thirteenth century, it cannot be said that leaseholding as a system had been generally adopted even at the beginning of the reign of Edward III. For in many places the older system of communal farming under capitalist landlords, though it showed signs of breaking down, never actually became obsolete until the whole country had been devastated and every economic relation disarranged by the Great Plague which first broke out in 1348, and which of necessity forms the starting-point for a completely new period.

Up to this year very little outward alteration occurred, men being apparently contented with their prospects and surroundings, and only a gradual improvement of agriculture on the old lines is observable. This state of things would seem to be due to the comparatively peaceful nature of the reigns of Henry III. and his two successors, and to the fact that, with the exception of the ten years 1311-1321, the time, as a whole, was one of prosperous seasons and plenteous harvests, during which everyone devoted his best energies to improving his material condition, and so had little inducement to grumble or think about making fundamental alterations. The ten excepted years, however, show a general rise in prices and must be admitted to have been years of scarcity, while it is known from many Periods of Dearth. independent sources that in 1316 and 1317 there was an absolute and perhaps unexampled famine. This was caused by the exceptionally wet summers which, not in one district only, but all over the country, were experienced both in 1315 and in 1316, and which in both years brought about an almost total failure of the grain crops. The famine, in fact, was so bad and so general that in some places it raised the price of corn in the first year to nearly 27s. a quarter, or about five times the amount it ordinarily sold for, and to very little under four times the amount in the second year; while at the

same time the prices of all other commodities rose in proportion. What an amount of misery and even of starvation this must have meant to the great bulk of the people can perhaps best be indicated by stating that never in the 300 years that have elapsed since 1582 has the English farmer been able to sell his corn at much more than double the ordinary price current before a dearth, and certainly never for two years in succession. One other misfortune must also be mentioned which overtook the agriculturist in this period, and that was the outbreak of a new disease among the sheep just as they were beginning to be kept in large numbers and to assume an important place in the economy of English farms. This was the scab, which seems first to have appeared in 1288, and which has remained a common disease ever since.

Of the more general characteristics of agriculture at this time it may be remarked that, as in the preceding centuries so in the thirteenth and fourteenth, the vast majority of the population of the country must have been continuously engaged in farming. The proof of this is simply a matter of arithmetic; for the rate of production during all this period was so low (on the average not more than eight bushels an acre for wheat, or four times the amount sown, and not more than  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times for barley) that otherwise it would have been impossible to keep alive even the modest population of between 1,500,000 and 2,000,000, which it is estimated England then possessed. In consequence, the inhabitants of the towns, though they were now rising rapidly in wealth and importance, still remained to a large extent agriculturists, and in any case went out into the fields during the harvest time. It is said, too, that the students at the Universities, which first begin to attract our attention at this time, were expressly given the long vacation in the summer, with which we are still acquainted, in order that they might return home at this season and share in the labour of reaping and carrying with the rest of their relations; and the same is perhaps true of the lawyers. The considerations, too, which lead us to suppose that nearly everyone in England took some share in the production of the annual food supply also compel us to believe that in the more thickly-populated districts of the country not much less land was regularly under plough and used especially for

1273]

wheat cultivation in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries than at present. For otherwise not enough acres could have been sown to produce for each man the quarter of wheat which, on the average, he must yearly have consumed; and at this time wheaten bread was an almost universal article of diet, even among the poorest classes. At first sight this seems improbable, but it must be remembered that in many places throughout England, as, for instance, on the South Downs, there are unmistakable traces of former cultivation still existing in the ridges and furrows on lands that have not been ploughed up for centuries; that at this early date hardly any land was set aside for either parks or pleasure grounds, and none used permanently for dairy-farming; and lastly, that wheat seems to have been cultivated with comparative success during these centuries even in the northern counties of Northumberland and Durham, whereas only a century ago it was popularly supposed that such a thing was impossible anywhere north of the Humber. In fact, one of the general characteristics of this period is that the processes of cultivation varied very little throughout the country, and that the same kinds of grain were sown, the same kinds of stock kept, and the same sort of labour required both in the north and in the south. Nor is the reason for this far to seek; for the object of every landowner was to make each manor as self-supporting as possible. A few articles, such as iron for tools and horseshoes, or salt for curing, had, of course, in most localities, to be obtained from outside; but this was avoided wherever possible, and no effort spared which could possibly make the home production sufficient to meet all the requirements of the simple style of living then customary. In a word, the advantages of a division of labour were hardly appreciated, and so, though some localities must have been best adapted for pasturage, and others for rye and oat-growing, yet there were hardly any parts of the country used for farming on which some amount of wheat and barley was not produced, and where all kinds of stock were not kept. From an agricultural point of view, that is to say, England was not, as now, split up into several districts, each practising more especially some particular branch of farming, but only into two main divisions—the lowlands, where everyone farmed on

**Mixed Farming.**

a uniform plan, and the highlands, moors, and mountains, where no agriculture at all was attempted, and which were still almost uninhabited, except, indeed, in some parts of Yorkshire, where the Cistercians and other orders of monks had introduced sheep-farming and made a beginning at reclaiming the wilderness.

In keeping also with this state of things  
**The Distribution of Population.** was the distribution of the population, which, instead of being thickest in the hilly districts of the north and west, as at present, was chiefly confined to the south and east, the area of greatest density being approximately marked by a line drawn from Norfolk through Reading to Dorsetshire. The general distribution of wealth in the agricultural districts during this period, if we exclude the towns, is naturally in the main similar. Thus in 1341, a year in which Edward III. laid a wool tax on all England for the purposes of his French war, the details of which have been accurately preserved, we find that Norfolk was by far the richest county; for in this district every 610 acres was expected to furnish a sack of wool or its money value to the Exchequer, whereas in the average county only one sack was demanded from every 1,570 acres. It must, however, be admitted that this great comparative prosperity was not wholly due to any marked superiority in the agriculture of the Norfolk landowners, but rather to the fact that their county happened at this time to be the site of the woollen trade, and consequently was largely inhabited by wealthy Flemish weavers and other foreign craftsmen, the majority of whom resided and worked in the villages. Of purely agricultural districts, Middlesex—excluding London—and Oxfordshire seem to have been the wealthiest, each of these counties having to furnish one sack of wool to every 760 acres; and then come Bedfordshire, Kent, and Berkshire. Instances of counties far below the average in wealth, and yet not particularly mountainous, are furnished by Shropshire and Herefordshire, in each of which only one sack was demanded from every 3,500 acres; while poorest of all were the modern manufacturing districts of Lancashire and the West Riding of Yorkshire.

The evidence that has come down to us of greater attention having been paid by the landowners to agriculture during

1278]

the thirteenth century than in preceding years is twofold, and consists firstly in the fact that in this century there appeared in England for the first time systematic treatises and manuals dealing with estate-management in its various forms as an art, and designed so as to be of practical assistance both to the landowners and their servants when in difficulties; and secondly in the great mass of written documents still existing in our public libraries and in the muniment rooms of colleges and other landed corporations, which deal in detail with the actual working of particular manors during the reigns of Henry III. and Edward I., and which are either non-existent or practically so for any earlier period. Both these novelties in their origin are no doubt to be ascribed to the example and influence of the great monastic houses, who at all periods bestowed a good deal of attention on their estates, and can in most instances be shown to have been the pioneers in any substantial improvements that were introduced into mediæval farming; but it is certain that by 1259 their example had also been followed by the greater lay landowners, and that written documents such as we have just referred to had by this time begun to be regularly kept on the majority of their estates.

The earliest treatise on estate-management that can be dated with certainty is a little book written in Norman-French between 1240 and 1241 by Robert Grosseteste, the celebrated Bishop of Lincoln, for Margaret, the Dowager Countess of Lincoln, and known by the name of "The Rules of St. Robert." This, however, does not appear to have had a very large circulation—perhaps because it was originally written for a woman, and chiefly dealt with the management of the household. More popular but undated and anonymous works of this period are those called "Husbandry" and "Seneschaucie," both also written in Norman-French. The first of these deals more particularly with the methods of keeping farming accounts, while the second describes the duties of the various manorial officers, beginning with the seneschal or steward, and so on down through the various grades to the dairymaid. By far the most popular, however, and also the most practical of all these early treatises was that written by Sir Walter de Henley some time before the year 1250, and

**Books on  
Agriculture.**



entitled "Le dite de Hosebondrie" or by some "Du Gaignage des Terres." In this the author, who had himself been a farmer, and perhaps the bailiff of an estate belonging to Canterbury Cathedral, surveys each of the departments of rural economy — such as ploughing and harrowing—in turn, and shows how a prudent owner will set about supervising everything if he wishes to manage his estates thriftily. This treatise, indeed, obtained such a reputation that it remained the standard English work on farming for more than 200 years, and even then was only supplanted by Sir Anthony Fitzherbert's work, which embodied a good deal of its contents. Another class of treatises which may be noted as dating first of all from this period, and which also bear to a certain extent on estate management, though more indirectly, is formed by the numerous formularies and precedents for holding manorial courts, which were drawn up at any rate not later than the reign of Edward II.—for these legal handbooks, equally with the more strictly economic manuals, all tend to show that the men of these times felt a desire to regulate their affairs better, and wished to set up a standard for their subordinates to work by, so that each might readily judge whether the most was being made out of his individual property.

Of the documents dealing with particular estates — or  
**Manorial Records.** manorial records, as they may most properly be called—there are three distinct kinds, which all came into vogue in the reign of Henry III. These are—(1) The Extent, or detailed survey of each manor, made on the pattern of the returns in Domesday, but at much greater length; (2) the Manorial Court Rolls, imitated from the records kept in the King's Courts; and (3) the "Compotus," or annual profit-and-loss account rendered by the bailiff to the non-resident landlord, much in the same way as the sheriff's yearly accounted for the firm of their counties to the Exchequer. The first of these, which was compiled from the sworn testimony of the villagers themselves, and only revised at long intervals, presents us with a minute description of the capabilities and acreage of all the land in the manor to which it relates, together with an accurate enumeration of all the tenants, both free and in villanage, who either held land of the lord or in any way owed him services, ending finally with a list of what these services were and what



1273]

they were worth in money. In the second we have a record of all the petty business transacted in the manor court, showing how from time to time the various tenements changed hands, how the homagers shared the burdens that were laid on them, how frequently they attempted to evade their services, and by what penalties they had to be enforced. From the third we can see what kind of expenses a Plantagenet landlord annually incurred, how far he depended on the honesty of his bailiff, how he rewarded his labourers, and how much income he might reasonably expect to receive from the manor in average years. Of course, it is only in comparatively rare instances that the records now extant of any one manor furnish information on anything like all the points just enumerated, or even contain contemporaneous specimens of all the three kinds of documents. The records, however, of one kind or another that have survived are so numerous, and relate to so many localities, that were space available, it would be possible to reconstruct an almost complete picture of the farming practised in England until the Black Death. As it is, a mere outline, such as is given in the next chapter, must suffice: an outline, too, which in strictness only applies to the larger estates. For it should be remembered that it was only on the estates of large landowners that records were kept, and we ought not, therefore, to assume that the small squires and under-tenants always cultivated their holdings in the same way, though the assumption in itself is not at all improbable.

To trace the development of British trade in the thirteenth century would seem at first sight a comparatively simple and at the same time a somewhat unprofitable task. Not only are the data available exceedingly scanty, but the historical interest of the period does not consist in these material considerations, but rather in the study of certain political and social phenomena of a very distinct character. On the one hand we have to trace the struggle for the Charters—confirmed a hundred times during the century—and on the other the steps by which the fusion of the races and the vindication of the native literature were accomplished. Moreover, the king and

**HUBERT HALL.**  
Trade and  
Industry.

his council were not so much engaged in discussing the balance of trade or the distribution of wealth as in useless attempts to solve the great problem of a disjointed empire which could no longer be reclaimed or defended with the aid of obsolete feudal services.

In fact, however, the opening years of the thirteenth century do form an important epoch in the history of trade and commerce, if only that we now have access for the first time to a new and somewhat neglected source of information. The statistics available for this subject can hitherto be sparsely gleaned from the rolls and registers of the Exchequer, from isolated Charters, and from the vague and metaphorical descriptions of contemporary historians. From the close of the thirteenth century onwards the commercial progress of the nation is fairly illustrated by the rolls of Parliament, and by the elaborate enrolled accounts of the collectors of customs and subsidies which were subsidiary to the making of the Budget. For the intervening period which is now under our notice invaluable evidence is furnished by the great series of the rolls of the Chancery. These records not only supply much information respecting the extent of trade, as gauged by payments or fines for licences, safe-conducts, and other privileges of the merchants, but they also afford indirect evidence as to the growing importance of this trade in the shape of precedents for its control and regulation by the Crown. From this new source, as well as from sources which already existed, from municipal or manorial accounts and precedent books, and from reasonable analogy, we may formulate the conditions under which English trade and commerce were pursued from the death of King John to the accession of Edward I. on the following lines.

In the thirteenth century, and down to a much later date, the classification of trade corresponds very nearly with a division under the heads of exports and imports, although we have also to consider that certain branches of native industry were practically in the hands of foreigners through the inexperience of native traders and the odium which attached to the pursuit of sordid gains. Nevertheless, native traders can at least be recognised in this period as a typical class of the community. In a country whose products are not absolutely

**Sources of  
Information.**

**Products of the  
Soil.**

1273]

self-sufficing—that is to say, which imports foreign wares as necessities or luxuries of life—there must be some channel for disposing of native products in exchange for those imports. In the same way one district must exchange its peculiar products with those of another, and each producer must furnish himself with what he needs for maintaining the rate of production. It would be difficult to imagine any period of our history in which some such system of barter or trade did not exist, and in the thirteenth century it had attained very definite proportions.

The English at this period being essentially an agricultural nation, it follows that the staple trade consisted mainly in products of the soil, such as corn, flesh, and dairy produce. These products—or, rather, the surplus which remained after the wants of the family had been satisfied, and the land stocked for the ensuing year—were sold at the local market or at one of the great annual fairs, and the proceeds, after the purchase of a number of necessities, went to swell the credit side of the landowner's account.

The abundant illustrations of the manorial economy which exist from the middle of the thirteenth century enable us to realise the whole process of this familiar traffic—the steward and the foreman (*messor*) tallying the corn out of the grange into the carts for market, after the seed-corn required for the autumn and spring sowing had been set apart; the thinning-out of the flocks at Martinmas, both of those bred on the farm and those bought last Hock-tide to be fattened and sold at a profit (with due regard to the requirements of the salting-house for victualling the household until Easter), and the summer output of the dairy-house in the form of “weighs” of thin cheeses, greatly reduced in bulk after the harvest-rations supplied to the lord's “boon-men.”

The above products of the soil were not, however, the only ones employed as marketable commodities. From a very early period it had been discovered that flocks and herds were scarcely less valuable for their pelts and hides than for their flesh, and thus the sale of wool, and wool-fells and hides, is a very important item in the manorial accounts. As a minor profit may be reckoned also the animal fats produced from the operations of the slaughter-house. Other products of the soil, as iron, lead, tin, stone, and wood, though equally the

fruits of rural industry, may be enumerated under a separate head. At the same time they are to be included with the former among the staple products of this country.

The same sources of information furnish us indirectly with a list of the chief imports employed by the agricultural community. The steward, in rendering his account of the profits of the estate, was allowed for certain articles purchased for the purpose of its suitable cultivation, among which tar, canvas, and mill-stones are most frequently mentioned. This list is further supplemented by the household and revenue accounts of the Crown or of some great lord, until it assumes very formidable proportions, including in the thirteenth century such articles as cloths of fine texture (especially those which were dyed in grain or self-coloured), silks, furs, jewels, groceries of all kinds, wax (in great request for candles and seals in the court and monastery), wine (for the hall or tavern), and salt.

These various imports reached the English seaports by several recognised trade-routes. The produce of the north-eastern countries of Europe, representing what may be called the Baltic trade, was, from the middle of the thirteenth century, almost entirely in the hands of the great federation known as the Hanse, and by the enterprise of this body England was plentifully supplied with furs, tar, and fish—especially herring. Naturally this trade was directed to the north-eastern ports of this country. Indirectly also there was a communication with the East through this channel, the connecting link being the great Russian fair of Novgorod.

Besides this general trade with the Hanse, there was also a considerable trade with Flanders and with the North of France; but the Hanse practically held sway from Antwerp in the north to Cologne in the south, its members being better known at a slightly later date as the Easterlings.

In another direction Southampton was the recognised emporium for the Mediterranean trade, already almost exclusively in the hands of the great Italian republics, whose citizens monopolised the carrying trade of the highly-valued products of the East. These, which consisted for the most part in spices,

1273]

reached the Mediterranean either by the Asiatic route to the ports of Antioch and Trebizond, or through Egypt to Alexandria, and the difficulties of transport entailed almost prohibitive prices. Silks, however, were the staple wares of the Italian cities, which probably exported also, like those of Flanders, a considerable quantity of fine cloths. It is needless to enlarge upon the impetus which this Mediterranean trade received from the Crusades during the thirteenth century, or on the opportunities thus offered for independent observation and invaluable experience to the Northern nations until the spirit of adventure led them in turn to follow new trade-routes to the far East.

After all, however, furs, silks, and spices formed but a small proportion of our staple imports. The demand for these luxuries, though steady and always increasing, was almost exclusively confined to the Court and to the wealthy classes, whilst the demand for wine and salt was of an almost national character.

The proportion between the several classes of imports may be most easily realised from the fact that at a slightly later date the collective proceeds of the taxation of merchandise by the name of poundage barely exceeded that of the tunnage and prisage of wines. Indeed, the arrival of the wine fleet from the centre and south of France, and from the Rhine districts, was an event almost as important as the safe despatch of the English wool fleet to the Flemish ports.

Native products and foreign imports being thus available for sale, we have next to ascertain the usual means by which this was effected. From a **Distributing Agencies.** very early period markets had been established in convenient situations. In Domesday Book the market appears as the natural complement of the manorial economy, and in the thirteenth century few considerable franchises could be found without this profitable seignorial appanage. Three things were necessary for the holding of a market—a suitable position in connection with some highway; the grant of the privilege in question by the Crown to the lord of the soil; and the regulation of the market and the receipt of the dues by the lord. The ordinary market held on a certain week-day is one of those episodes which have continued to be enacted with little change during the lapse of centuries.

A far more important event in this century was one of the great annual fairs, at which the entire produce of the county, and the typical imports also, were exposed for sale. These also, like the local markets, were held under the protection and subject to the jurisdiction of some lord. The risk and cost of attending these meetings must, however, have been considerable.

In the middle of the previous century, we are told, the rents of the king's farms payable in kind—that is, in oxen, sheep, and grain—were commuted for money-rents, owing to the insupportable expense of conveyance to the Court. The roads were inconceivably bad, and even carriage by water was sadly hindered by the weirs and other engines of riparian owners, against which a long string of denouncements, from the Great Charter onwards, have been vainly directed, whilst the apparatus employed was also exceedingly rudimentary. It has even been asserted, with some probability, that the usual excellence of imported wines was merely owing to the fact that only a superior quality would pass the ordeal of the journey. It is true that travelling on certain roads had attained something of the excellence of the later posting system; for instance, the recognised stages from London to Dover *en route* for Paris and Rome, as they were known to Matthew Paris and his contemporaries; but although horse-flesh was cheap, this procedure entailed considerable expense where strangers were compelled to occupy appointed lodgings, and where tolls and ferries could not be circumvented. Once off the beaten track, there was almost a certainty of surprise by the outlaws or robbers who infested the wooded gorges and lonely heaths in the vicinity of the great cities and fairs.

The periodical markets of the villages and smaller towns were chiefly employed for local traffic of the same nature as that which prevails to the present day. The markets of the larger towns also resembled those of our own time, except that the nature of the wares and the nationality of the sellers were somewhat sharply distinguished. In the case of Smithfield Market, for instance, a thoroughly representative stock of cattle and horses was collected every six weeks. Besides these permanent markets, with their fixed or movable stalls, goods were exposed in the

1273]

ordinary way beneath the projecting pent-houses of the shops, while some kinds, and especially fuel and water, were hawked about the streets in carts, as they are even to the present day. The fair, though naturally of less antiquity than the market, was, however, a far more distinctive feature of the commercial life of the thirteenth century. This, like the market, was the perquisite of some lord ; it was also held at certain dates, but usually only once a year, on some appropriate feast-day. Several of the English fairs enjoyed a European reputation, but two stand out from among the rest as the natural centres of English commerce in the east and south.

Stourbridge Fair was most conveniently situated for the exchange or export of the products of the eastern counties, and for the sale of the foreign commodities of the Baltic trade. The fair was opened on the 18th of September and lasted for three weeks, being held under the authority of the Corporation of Cambridge. It was situated in the open country, and temporary booths were erected every year, forming streets which covered a total area of half a square mile. The chief business done seems to have been the sale of wool and cloth for exportation and the purchase of the wares of Hanse merchants, but every trade and every nationality was represented in its numerous streets.

**Stourbridge Fair.**

Winchester Fair was of even greater importance in the thirteenth century, since it was connected with the great emporium of the south-eastern trade, Southampton, and the linked ports of London and Sandwich. Here the fair was under the immediate control of the Bishop, by whose officers it was proclaimed on the Eve of St. Giles, to last for sixteen days. The site of the fair was the hill overlooking the city, which was covered with stalls, forming distinct streets, allotted in the usual manner to the several trades and nationalities. Since it was an essential condition of the holding of a fair that it should enjoy a monopoly of trade in the vicinity for the time being, the greatest precautions were taken for putting a stop to unlicensed trade within certain limits, in order that the profits of the lord might not be diminished. It was at the same time to the advantage of the mercantile community that a strict police and a close supervision over weights and measures should be

**Winchester Fair.**



maintained, and in return for these advantages the greater number of merchants gladly paid the heavy entrance-toll and the fees at the wool-beam, although cases are recorded in which certain penurious traders endeavoured to evade these payments by burrowing under the palisades or lingering after the fair was at an end to conclude their bargains free of registration dues. In this, as in every other fair, there was a Court of

**Courts of Pie-  
Powder.**

Pie-powder, so called because the several disputes which arose were adjudged with a dispatch that suited the convenience of transitory suitors—the men with “dusty feet.” From the fact, however, that the cases which arose were mostly trade disputes and outside the narrow purview of the common law, a good deal of interest attaches to their decision by a jury of experts. In this aspect the merchants made their own law, but there were also a large number of cases which did not involve a consideration of “tallies” and “God’s-pennies,” but merely proof of fraud or violence. Thus we read in the court-roll of St. Ives of a defendant charged with selling a ring of brass for 5½d., saying “that the ring was of the purest gold, and that he and a one-eyed man found it on the last Sunday in the church of St. Ives, near the Cross.” We gather, however, that in most cases the bargain was satisfactorily concluded by a drink.

Besides Stourbridge and Winchester, there were important fairs held at Boston, St. Ives (Hunts), Stamford, Oxford, Abingdon, St. Edmundsbury, Nottingham, and other places.

The industrial progress of the thirteenth century cannot on the whole be regarded as very considerable.

**Growth of  
Industry.**

The national wealth was still measured by the welfare of the landed interest. The gap between the artistic feeling of the Romanised Briton and the engrafted skill of the fourteenth-century artisan is a very wide one, but in some aspects the thirteenth century may be regarded as a typical era in the history of English industry. If the industrial reforms of the fourteenth century are regarded as a new and momentous departure, it cannot be too carefully remembered that almost the whole of English trade was at this time in the hands of aliens, and that native enterprise and adventure toiled painfully in the wake of the Free Cities of the Continent, as the small “cog” was outstripped by the great “carrack” in the Mediterranean trade. Nay, down to the very

1273]

eve of the industrial revolution in the eighteenth century, the textile fabrics for which this country had long enjoyed the highest reputation were petty industries, supplementing the national occupation of agriculture, the gathering of that other harvest of the sea, and the feverish quest of hidden treasures of the earth. But although we should seek in vain in the thirteenth century, or long afterwards, for any English industry to compare with the great factories of Florence, we cannot doubt that there was sufficient skill in the textile arts to render the industry self-sufficing. The clothing of every lowly and most middle-class households was manufactured at home, and this might be supplemented on rare occasions by the purchase, at any one of the great fairs, of the fine cloth imported from Flanders and Italy, or of that substantial product of the Anglo-Flemish looms, the cloth of assize, manufactured by the weavers' gilds in nearly all the great cities of England.

For the most part, however, the village crafts were self-sufficing. In every village wool and hemp were ready to hand for a score of spindles, Manufacture. and the stout yarn produced could be woven into coats and shirts, which needed not, in the eyes of their simple wearers, the embellishments of scarlet grain or Flemish madder. The great nobles hung these coarse friezes on their chamber walls; the king's officers stretched them on benches or on their Exchequer table; but the churl and villan, the monk and sometimes the franklin, wore them as their common habit. The village tanner and bootmaker supplied long gaskins of soft leather for such as needed more protection than home-made sandals. The professional hunter of wolves, cats, or otters, and even the humble molecatcher, supplied a head-covering for those who did not go bare-headed by choice; and the second great want of Nature was provided for the village resident. For other than the textile arts the smith was a recognised institution in every village, and possibly a carpenter for the construction of ploughs and carts. Even the ropes of hair or hemp which formed the chief part of their harness were home-made; but the manufacture of baskets and barrels was somewhat more local. For the building of a church or castle, carpenters and masons were imported from a distance, like the stone and shingles and lead with which they

worked; but the peasant erected his own wattled cabin, just as the sheriff's men could build the local gaol with saplings from the king's forest. Finally, the mill under the lord's control is another instance of a self-sufficing industry. Here all the tenants were virtually compelled to grind their corn, and the mill was consequently a paying concern from the date of Domesday survey down to comparatively modern times. At the same time we may recognise a growing regard for the value of even home-made cloth as an article of sale at the local markets and fairs, for, as we have seen, the native supply of this article was rather the surplus of a domestic manufacture than the regular output of the trade communities in the towns.

The thirteenth century saw the position of the English towns assured. Their prosperity had been already guaranteed by the acquisition of their charters in the twelfth. The town was naturally the industrial centre of a district and a unit of the industrial trade of the nation. In England, as in other countries of Europe, the bulk of trade as we now understand the term was carried on in the towns. These, from the early part of the twelfth century, had obtained in certain favoured instances very necessary and advantageous privileges for the purpose, which were expressed in charters enabling them to render an account of their own farms or assessments payable at the Exchequer. In addition to this concession, which secured them in the enjoyment of the fruits of their enterprise, the citizens obtained at several times the virtual privilege of self-government and also a general exemption from vexatious suits and arbitrary tolls outside their own cities. For example, the citizens of London were free of toll at the fair of Winchester if they availed themselves of this privilege within a reasonable date. Still more important for the welfare of the civic community was the recognition of the status of the gild-merchant.

In very early times societies had existed for social and religious intercourse and for the ensurance of mutual responsibility in the police system of the country. These were gradually enlarged for the purposes of trade; and having thus obtained, perhaps, a kind of legal status on the strength of their conformity with the laws of Church and State, they collectively assumed the

**The Merchant-Gilda.**

1273]

general control of trade as the Gild-Merchant. This body possessed a central establishment or gildhall, with officers and bye-laws, while outside the influence of the gild itself the machinery of municipal government was available for the common interests of the whole body of citizens. The trade of the country was, therefore, not only essentially municipal in character, but, more than this, it was inter-municipal—that is to say, the gild-brethren of one city were admitted on a common footing to the trade privileges of another city, and they were presumably responsible for the behaviour and liabilities of each other, as they certainly relieved the necessities of their poorer members. The inhabitants of the towns may thus be regarded somewhat in the light of a great family of traders with a common policy and objects; but as the family increased, the poor relations and strangers forming the great class of the artisans who had long enjoyed a more or less independent recognition in the craft-gilds, legalised by the Crown since the middle of the twelfth century, were induced at length to adopt a system of government amongst themselves with the object of regulating their own work—not necessarily with the intention of wresting a monopoly of trade and government from the hands of an exclusive municipality, but merely that their interests might no longer be overlooked in the government of a greater city.

It is not very evident, however, that the industries even of the towns were very extensive or flourishing during this period. It is true that these Industrial Life. townsmen were presumably the descendants of those who had flocked together at some convenient site for purposes of trade from a very early time; but of these some might be merchants, or even landed proprietors, and others were mere salesmen of imported wares, who lived chiefly by the custom of the Court or of the civic aristocracy. The most successful and enterprising of any were the Jews, and the most skilful of the true artisans were of Flemish extraction. However, we do find here a considerable population of artisans representing every known trade, though only such craft-gilds as are returned in the Pipe Rolls need be considered as of much importance. These include the weavers, who were established in most of the principal towns, the fullers, the bakers, with others—such as the loriners and the cordwainers. The goldsmiths were in

high repute, but artistic metal work like armour seems to have been usually imported. A very large provision of war-like gear, together with silks, trappings, pavilions, girdles, and fine cloths, was, however, made for the king's use every year by the sheriffs of London and Middlesex; and these at least may have been manufactured in the city, since they figure indiscriminately in the Pipe Rolls with undoubted native products. We certainly read of a shield-maker (at York) and of a saddler who were fined for selling arms to the king's enemies as early as the great rebellion of 1173-4; and slightly earlier, merchants of Gloucester were forbidden to equip the English adventurers for the conquest of Ireland. In the reign of John we have a list of nearly thirty towns in which a trade in dyed cloths had been carried on for half a century. Indeed, the very arrangements of the mediæval shop were made with a view to manufacture on the premises, the dwelling-chamber being in the upper storey, over an apartment used as a workshop, the goods being exposed for sale on a bench beneath the overhanging porch. It was a feature of these urban industries that the respective crafts were brought together each in a distinct quarter of the city, just as we have seen them grouped in the temporary stalls of the great provincial fairs, and this arrangement much facilitated the close supervision that was exercised by the gild officers over the quality and workmanship of their wares.

The Norman Conquest effected no more momentous change in the social condition of this country than by opening English ports to the commerce of the west and south of Europe.

Foreign  
Intercourse.

Hitherto English commerce had been of the north, piratical, until the civilisation of the Scandinavian kingdoms and the humanising influence of the Roman Church caused a temporary depression in barbarian enterprise. The beneficial effect of Continental influences was ultimately attained in the thirteenth century, when the intermunicipal trade of the great Free Cities of Europe had begun to have full play. Then the natural wealth of the land, formerly the tempting prey of northern freebooters and for long past the vaunt of native chroniclers, began to be gradually realised by the intelligent nations of the south. However, it was not between nations that the new conditions of commerce were established, but

1273]

among cities. The Germans were merchants of Cologne or of Hamburg, and they were not only the emperor's men but also members of the German gild, which had its Hanse-houses in several of the chief English cities. It was the same with the citizen merchants of the great Italian republics or the States of Flanders. Such a title as "merchant of France" was never heard of at the time, but there were merchants of Gascony, and a swarm of hardy fishermen from the Norman and Breton seaports, with whom the men of the Cinque Ports waged deadly war for the sovereignty of the narrow seas, from the days of Hubert de Burgh to those of Stephen de Penchester. On the whole, however, the amenities of commercial intercourse were faithfully observed, Germans, Northmen, Gascons, and Lombards receiving valuable privileges in their English factories, and English citizens claiming equal protection for their own gild brethren in foreign ports. In one aspect we observe the renovation of the earlier trade with northern lands which centred in the elaborate organisation of the Hanse towns; in another aspect intercourse with Rome and the Crusading movement brought England into commerce with the Mediterranean states. In both directions we benefited by inexhaustible markets for our wool and other exported products, and perhaps equally by the well-earned comfort afforded by soft raiment and fragrant spices. Again, there was another sort of commerce imparted to us from the Continent—namely, that which was invidiously conducted by the Jewish and Flemish residents.

From a period antecedent to the Conquest itself commerce had been—nominally, at least—under the control of the Crown. This we can gather from the Saxon laws, and this still continued to be no less necessary in the thirteenth century in the real or fancied interests of law and order and generally for the national welfare. Traders might be at this date, as they were invariably in later times, classified according to their respective status as natives, aliens, and denizens—all of whom were subject, in the first place, to certain exactions, and secondly to certain restraints imposed by the Crown. This may be regarded as the imperial side of the subject, as distinct from the municipal or local, which has hitherto engaged our attention. The origin of the royal prerogative herein may perhaps be

**Regulation of  
Trade.**



traced from the tribal contributions in support of the kingly state, which took the later forms of purveyance, pre-emption, prisage and butlerage, dismes, and finally Customs. But however this may be we find that from the middle of the twelfth century onwards a regular scale of dues was levied at the outports. Similar dues were also exacted by seignorial and municipal franchises, but these depended in turn upon a grant from the Crown. London, Sandwich, Southampton, and Boston were early centres for the collection of the king's Customs, which were usually accounted for by the Chamberlains until the appointment of collectors and controllers under Edward I. Wine was an especial subject of taxation, native merchants being liable to supply one or two tuns from before and behind the mast, according to the size of the vessel, at a low price to the king's purveyors. In the same way aliens paid a toll of two shillings on every tun, known as the butlerage; this and the above toll in kind—or prisage, as it was called—being collected by the King's Butler. As the average wholesale price of wine during this period was very low, the native trader was more favourably treated than the alien, who was often liable to arbitrary purveyance. But when the value of wine was trebled in the next century, the former was a loser by the composition which he obstinately clung to, while the latter benefited largely by the old rate of butlerage as finally settled in 1303. During three years of the middle of the thirteenth century we learn that 1,455 tuns of prise wines were taken at London and Sandwich alone. As each tun may be taken to represent an average cargo of twenty casks, the average annual importation to these linked ports was about 10,000 tuns.

The Customs or duties on other articles of merchandise usually took, at the close of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth centuries, the form of a tenth or fifteenth. In the reign of John we find a fifteenth regularly levied at all the outports of England, of which as many as from thirty to forty make returns, the total amounting to about £5,000. But considerable as is the revenue which is thus accounted for in the Exchequer Rolls of the period, it is possible that a still larger profit was realised by the exercise of the king's prerogative in the restraint of trade.



The nature of these exactions may be gathered from the Chancery Rolls, from which it appears that large fines were paid by divers merchants for licences to trade—namely, to export woad, wool, and leather, as well as corn and other provisions from England, or for safe-conducts and protection for themselves and their merchandise throughout the king's dominions, free of arbitrary prises and tolls. These fines were naturally most frequently paid by foreign merchants, and they varied from a sum of four thousand marks to a present of a palfrey or hawk. In spite of the well-known article of *Magna Charta*, the restraint of trade and the exactions which accompanied it were continued with little intermission down to the reign of Edward I., when a fixed tariff at the outports, coupled with a vigorous foreign policy, gave a new stimulus to English commerce.

In another way the Crown obtained a close hold on the workings of native commerce through its relations with the Jews, who, even more than non-resident aliens, were wholly at its mercy.

The Jews  
and the Crown.

As the commercial undertakings of this race were very extensive, and as they were the chief, if not the only, capitalists of the age, it will be evident that the importance of these relations can scarcely be over-estimated; for the Crown had it in its power, by bringing pressure to bear upon the Jews, to cause something like a financial crisis at any moment. On the whole, perhaps, its action in this respect was beneficial to the community, since the regulation of Jewish money-dealings checked for a time the worst abuses of usurious contracts, although there is also some truth in the old simile of a sponge by means of which a large part of the subjects' wealth found its way into the Royal Exchequer.

The influence which the Jews exerted upon English commerce in the thirteenth century was undoubtedly of benefit to the civic population, since they served as a sort of buffer between the native traders and the dominant landed interest. The victims of their usury were almost invariably the improvident landowners, whose feudal turbulence had once been the greatest drawback to the prosperity of the country. It was in the interests of the latter that they were finally expelled, a measure which may also be regarded as a desperate expedient on the part of the Crown to compel its feudal

tenants to contribute more liberally to its pressing necessities, since, Jewish creditors having forfeited their abandoned estates to the Crown, pressure could be put upon their Christian debtors to discharge outstanding obligations.

ONE great event of the reign of Henry III. was the famine with pestilence in the years 1257 to 1259. It appears to have helped, along with one or two other notorious famines, to give England a wholly undeserved repute among foreigners as being a country in which famine was habitual. But the famine and pestilence of 1257-9 was a solitary instance in a whole generation, and there was nothing like it again until 1315-16. Like other great famines in England, it was due to a succession of bad harvests, following either cold and backward springs or wet autumns; but the scarcity and dearness of corn would hardly have had so disastrous effects had it not been that the country was drained of its circulating coin, partly by levies for the Roman See, and partly by king's taxes, which somehow were in pawn to the king's brother, the Earl of Cornwall, candidate for the crown of the Holy Roman Empire, and were used by him to pay his German troops and to buy the votes of the electoral princes. The scarcity began to be felt in the winter of 1256-7, and was followed by many deaths from hunger in 1257. There was little harvest that year, partly from neglect to till and sow the ground; and in May, 1258, a pestilence followed, which must have been one of the greater kind if the mortality in London had been only a fraction of the numbers alleged—namely, fifteen thousand, mostly of the poorer class. This is perhaps the earliest occasion on which large quantities of grain were imported to the Thames from Germany and Holland, the Earl of Cornwall having sent over sixty ship-loads, which were sold to his account to the starving Londoners. According to Matthew Paris, who was then living at St. Albans, the quantity of grain imported was more than three English counties had produced in the harvest before. But calamities did not come singly. Although the harvest of 1258 was an unusually rich one, the hopes of the husbandmen were blighted by cruel rains throughout the whole end of the year, which left the heavy crops rotting on the ground, so that the fields were

C. CREIGHTON.  
Public Health.

1273]

like so many dung-heaps. Whatever corn was saved turned mouldy; the people struggled through the winter and spring (1259) with sacrifice of their cattle and with much sickness and mortality. This had been a characteristic English famine, due to a succession of bad seasons, and aggravated by economic or fiscal troubles. The first bad harvest had caused a smaller breadth to be sown for the year following, that had likewise turned out ill; the third harvest had been spoiled by incessant rain, and the whole calamitous episode had been made infinitely harder to bear by the heavy taxes and the consequent dearth of money. The English famines of that degree had not been many—one happened in the last year of the Conqueror's reign (1086-7), another in 1195-7, after the return of Richard I. from the Crusade; a third as above related; a fourth during the weak government of Edward II. in 1315-16; and, not to mention various local famines, one more in the fifteenth century (1439) as the climax of two or more bad seasons, which were even more disastrous in Scotland and in France. The price of corn was far from steady in the intermediate years; two or three years of very low prices would be followed by years when corn was twice, thrice, or four times as dear. But great fluctuations were normal, if one may so speak, in the mediæval period; it needed a rise of eight or ten times from the lowest price to produce the true effects of famine, probably because in an ordinary dear year the poorer classes fell back upon oats, barley, and beans, instead of wheat, which was the staple bread-corn of England. These great fluctuations enabled the rich to grow richer; thus it is on record that the Archbishop of York, in the rather sharp scarcity of 1234, had his granaries at Ripon stored with the corn of four harvests, two or three of which had been hard for the poor. Even in the sharp famine of London in the summer of 1258, when the Earl of Cornwall's sixty cargoes of grain arrived, the first thing that the king had to do was to issue an ordinance against the greed of middlemen—forestallers and regrators, as they were then called.

OF the doings at the birth, marriage, or burial of the Normans in England we have but scant information.

We know all about the Anglo-Saxons, and of the social life of the fourteenth and

**Social Life  
and Manners.**

succeeding centuries we have abundance of evidence, yet of this particular period we know but little. The Anglo-Saxon MSS. give us many examples of the new-born babe, with and without its mother, and we see before us vividly the little one swathed like a mummy; but for the next two centuries we have few delineations of infant life in the MSS. But we get a glimpse of the conditions of early childhood in the treatise of Walter de Bibbesworth (printed in Mayer's "Library of National Antiquities"), who, writing at the close of the thirteenth century, describes with quaint minuteness the various steps and stages of a child's up-bringing.

**Marriage.** Marriage seems to have been in general the outcome of affection on both sides, and was such a matter of course that very little was said about it.

Being a sacrament, the ceremony necessarily took place in a church, a feast was made, with dancing afterwards, and the young couple were frequently seen to bed by their friends, and the nuptial couch blessed by being sprinkled with holy water by a priest or bishop. It was believed that angels, good or evil, hovered round the dying man's bed, and in the Life of St.

**Death and Burial.** Guthlac, a twelfth century MS., we see the angels taking his soul at the moment of his expiry. After death the corpse was washed and decently shrouded, then put in a coffin which was the same width all its length, the lid being sometimes coped, and ornamented with a cross. We see the corpse being watched by priests, who sing from the *Officium Defunctorum* the antiphon "Placebo Domino in regione vivorum," and the interment reverently performed by the priest with incense, etc. In the Bayeux Tapestry we see the corpse of King Edward, merely wrapped in a shroud, and carried on an open bier on the shoulders of eight men, whilst on either side is an acolyte ringing two bells. The priest and mourners follow; afterwards he is shown as being interred without a coffin.

**Education.** We have seen how the public school-boys were taught classics and logic, and it would seem that a private education of this period was reading, writing, and Latin, which, being a language common to the civilised world, stamped both the gentleman and the cleric. They were also, in domestic schools, taught manners fitted for a gentleman, how to demean and carry

1273]

themselves, their conduct in presence of others, and at table; to which end Robert Grossetête, Bishop of Lincoln, wrote his "*Liber Urbanitatis*." Norman French, the language of romance and of the minstrels, was naturally theirs by birth, and a gentleman should know the use of some instrument of music. Athletics, riding, and all manly exercises were taught as a matter of course. The girls learned reading and writing, music, and, according to their rank, housewifery, especially a smattering of medicine and surgery. Spinning, embroidery, and romance reading, when a book could be got, filled up the leisure moments, and for those of good social position there was riding and hawking. They had their pets to amuse them, birds, lap-dogs, and delicate little Italian greyhounds; and their gardens, too, must have been a great source of enjoyment, and they were very fond of dancing.

The Normans, at their first coming, had the credit given them of not only being more delicate in their food, but more abstemious than the

Food.

Anglo-Saxons; but they seem to have soon after declined to the same level. Here, again, we suffer much from the want of information as to how they lived, and what they lived on. We know that both William I. and his successor made right royal feasts, but there is no record of their *menus*,\* nor is there known to be in existence such a book of recipes for cooking as "*the Forme of Cury*," compiled about 1390, by the master cooks of King Richard II. But we have some little aids by means of which we may know something of the kitchen and its interior, among which is a treatise on utensils by Alexander Neckam, a distinguished scholar of his time, who was born at St. Albans in 1157 and died in 1217. He says:

"Whoever would well dispose his family, his household, and his goods, should first provide himself with utensils and household gear. In the kitchen should be a table, on which he can chop vegetables, such as lentils,

\* Walter de Biblesworth gives us one. He says that first is brought in a boar's head with its tusks in its snout, garnished with flowers, and then venison or furmenty, cranes, peacocks and swans, wild geese, kids, pigs and hens. The third course was of spiced and seasoned meats, with wine both red and white "*à graunt plenté*." Then came pheasants, woodcock, partridges, fieldfares, larks and plovers "*ben rostez*," with brawn and other things, and "*après manger avyunt à graunt plenté*" came white powder (*blanche poudre*) and large sweetmeats.

peas, and pulse, beans in their pods and without, millet, onions, and any kind of vegetables he can cut up. In the kitchen should be earthen pots, trivets, a hatchet, a mortar and pestle, a pike, a hook, a cauldron, a cooking-pot, a copper vessel, a small pan, a frying-pan, a gridiron, a pitcher, a round dish, a salver or waiter, a dessert dish, a salt-cellar, and knives with which fish may be disembowelled. There should be also a large ladle, wherewith to correct frothing and boiling over. In the hovel there should be either a hooked pole, or an eel-spear, or a dart, or light hooks, or a basket for taking fish to be lowered into the fish-pond. Also the head cook should have in the kitchen a cupboard in which to keep aromatic spices and meal flour, or the bread which he would rub through a sieve and mash up in order to pot small fish. There should also be a sluice, where birds, such as geese and domestic fowls, may have their breasts and legs washed by means of a tap, and thus be frequently cleaned. Also there should be a tap of hot water, where small things may be scalded. There should be a pepper mill, and a hand-mill. Small fish to be cooked should be put into sauce, or in muria, which is water mixed with salt. This sauce will not do for all fish, for they are different, namely, salmon, soles, conger, lamprey, mussel, smelt, gudgeon, barbel, loggerhead, sea-horse, cod, plaice, mullet, ray, dog-fish, mackerel, turbot, herring, lobster, sticklebacks pressed with egg, oysters, and bass. In the steward's room should be napkins, table-cloths, and towels, and a perch or hanging bar projecting from the walls, on which to hang garments. Here should be kept small knives, decorated salt-cellars, cheese covers, candelabra, sconces, lanthorns, and hand baskets for carrying anything. In the cellar should be barrels, wine skins, casks, hanaps and hanapers, spoons, a water clock, basons, small baskets, wines of various qualities, cider, beer or ale, must, clary,\* piment, mead or hydromel, perry, rose-wine, fruity wine, wine of Anverne, clove wine, for hard drinkers and gluttons, whose thirst is insatiable."—Mayer I. p. 96, seq.

With the Norman kings and nobility great attention was paid to food, especially to the dinner, the great meal of the day, which was under the conduct of the Dapifer, or steward—sometimes called the Dispensator; and he was a person of great consequence. For instance, William Fitz Osberne was Steward of the Household to William the Conqueror, who once, when he was served with an ill-roasted crane, got in such a rage that he would have smitten Fitz Osberne with his fist, had not Eudo, who was immediately afterwards made Dapifer in his place, warded off the blow. The Magister Coquus, or head-cook, occupied a position in the royal household equivalent to our clerk of the kitchen; and there were, besides, the clerk of the household, bread, and wine;

\* This must not be confused with the modern claret. It was compounded of white wine, honey, and spices—as was also piment.

1273]

stewards of the bread; sewers,\* stewards serving in turn; naperers, or those who looked after the table-linen; the usher of the dispensary, or steward's office; the counter of the bread; four bakers; the waferers, or pastry-cooks; the master-steward, and other stewards of the larder; cook and usher of the King's kitchen; keeper of the vessels. In the great kitchen there were two cooks, the King's poulterer, sergeants of the kitchen, usher of the spithouse, the turnspit, keeper of the dishes, carters of the great kitchen and larder, sergeant of the venison, a master-butler and his master-stewards of the butlery, the usher of the butlery, the butterer, the workmen of the buttery, the keeper of the cups, the keeper of the mazers,† the fruiterer and his three men—a very sufficient household.

Such luxury in eating could not fail to be followed as far as their means allowed by those of humbler station; and it came to such excess that Henry III., in the thirty-fourth year of his reign, ordained that, on common occasions, not more than two dishes should be served at one meal. In Henry II.'s time Giraldus Cambrensis relates the following, respecting the luxurious living of the monks, instancing those of Canterbury and Winchester:—

Their table (he says) consisted regularly of sixteen covers, or more, of the most costly dainties, dressed with the most exquisite cookery, to provoke the appetite and please the taste; they had an excessive abundance of wine, particularly claret, of mulberry wine, of mead, and other strong liquors, the variety of which was so great in these repasts that no place could be found for ale, though the best was made in England, and particularly in Kent.—*De Rebus a se Gestis* II. 5.

And he tells a story of the prior and monks of St. Swithin at Winchester:—

They threw themselves prostrate at the feet of King Henry II., and, with many tears, complained to him, that the bishop of that diocese, to whom they were subject, as their abbot, had withdrawn from them three of the usual number of their dishes. Henry enquired of them, how many there still remained; and, being informed they had ten, he said that he himself was contented with three, and imprecated a curse on the bishop if he did not reduce them to that number.—*Speculum Ecclesiae*, II. 3.

\* The office of sewer, or server, was a very honourable one—for instance, on the day when Henry II. joined his son with him in the Government, the king was his sewer, serving up the first dish.

† Wooden cups and bowls.



*Apropos* of this luxury of the monks, there is a very early English poem, certainly not later than the early twelfth century, from which the following little satire is taken:—

“ There is a wel fair abbei  
 Of white monkes and of grei,  
 Ther beth bowris and halles,  
 All of pasteis \* be the walles,  
 Of fleis, of fisse, and rich met,  
 The likfullist that man mai et.  
 Fluren cakes beth the schingles alle,  
 Of cherch, cloister, boure, and halle.  
 The pinnes † beth fat podinges,  
 Rich met to princes and kinges.

Ther beth IIII wellis ‡ in the abbei  
 Of triacle and halwei,  
 Of baum and ek piement.

gite I do gow mo § to witte  
 The Gees irosted on the spitte  
 Fleeth to that abbai, god hit wotte,  
 And gredith || Gees al hote, al hote.”—

[Harleian MS. ; quoted by Warton, *Hist. of Eng. Poetry*, I. p. 8.]

The dinner-table was laid with a fair white cloth, upon which were set bowls with broth, and boiled fowls and fish; and each person had a cup and a round or cake of bread, which served as a trencher, or thing to cut on. In the Bayeux Tapestry we have two feasts, including one on the open field, where there is a splendid *batterie de cuisine*, although some of the guests make tables of their shields. There we see them served, as in hall, with the meat, poultry, etc., on spits. The Normans had a cleanly habit of washing their hands before and after meals, which was necessary, as they had no forks, and were obliged to put their food into their mouths with their fingers. A knife, of course, they had, and each cut what he thought fit from the meat offered to him on the *broche*, depositing it on his slice of bread, or cake, upon which he cut it into smaller portions, eating the bread at last.

For those who had no homes, or whose business prevented them going thither to their dinner, there  
**Eating-Houses.** were, in London, at least, public eating-houses, one of which Fitz Stephen describes:—

\* Pasties. † Pins. ‡ Wells or Fountains. § More. || Cry.

"And, moreover, on the bank of the river, besides the wine sold in ships and vaults, there is a public eating house or cook's shop. Here, according to the season, you may find victuals of all kinds, roasted, baked, fried, or boiled. Fish, large and small, with coarse viands for the poorer sort, and more delicate ones for the rich, such as venison, fowls, and small birds. In case a friend should arrive at a citizen's house much wearied with his journey, and chooses not to wait, an-hungered as he is, for the buying and cooking of meat . . . recourse is immediately had to the bank above mentioned, where everything desirable is easily procured. No number so great, of knights or strangers, can either enter the city, at any hour of day or night, or leave it, but all may be supplied with provisions; so that those have no occasion to fast too long, nor these to depart from the city without their dinner. To this place, if they are so disposed, they resort, and there they regale themselves, every man according to his abilities. Those who have a mind to indulge, need not hanker after sturgeon, or a Guinea-fowl, or a Gelinote de Bois, for there are delicacies enough to gratify their palates. It is a public eating house, and is both highly convenient and useful to the City, and is a clear proof of its civilisation."—*Op. cit.*, p. 32, *seq.*

But, if there was plenty in London, it was not always so throughout England, for several years of scarcity are chronicled. "A great dearth Famine. chanced through this realm of England" in 1196. Another followed three years later. "A dearth of corne" in 1223. "A great dearth" in 1233 was succeeded by a pestilence, as was also another in 1257, when "a sore death and mortalitie followed for want of necessarie food to susteine the pining bodies of the poore people. They died so thicke, that there were great pits made in churchyards to laie the dead bodies in one upon another." Still, in London they were well looked after in the matter of bread, which about 1203 was regulated by law to vary, in a given degree, according to the price of wheat. Beer was afterwards treated in the same paternal manner. The baker was allowed a fair profit, and the loaf was to be of a specified weight and price. But woe be to a fraudulent baker! for it is written how Hugh Bigod, Lord Chief Justice, sat in judgment in Guildhall in 1258, and "yea, contrarie to the liberties of the citie, he punished bakers for lacke of true size by the tumbrell, where before they were punished by the pillorie."

Naturally, in a period of two hundred years from the coming of the Normans into England to the death of Henry III., there were changes of Costume.

costume; but on their advent, the Normans in their civil dress were very much like the Saxons. A tunic with a belt, and sometimes a mantle fastened at the shoulder with a morse (or brooch) or an ornamental pin; and drawers, called *chausses*, tight-fitting, and occasionally bandaged diagonally on the leg, were their outward garments. Sometimes they wore a flat cap; and they had a peculiar fashion—that of Aquitaine—of shaving the back of the head and whole face; and, judging by the Bayeux Tapestry, it was most unbecoming. William of Malmesbury speaks thus of them:—

“Harold,” he says, “sent out some persons to reconnoitre the number and strength of the enemy. These, being taken within the camp, William ordered to be led amongst the tents, and after feasting them plentifully, to be sent back uninjured to their lord. On their return, Harold inquired what news they brought; when, after relating at full the noble confidence of the general, they gravely added, that almost all his army had the appearance of priests, as they had the whole face with both lips shaven. For the English leave the upper lips unshorn, suffering the hair continually to increase.”—III. 239.

Their boots were short and of various colours, reaching above the ankle, and having a plain band round the top; and they also wore shoes, which, under the luxurious reign of William II., were worn very long. But he was extravagant in his tastes and dress; and, like many *nouveaux riches*, would have nothing but what cost much money. The chronicler just quoted relates the following story of him:—

“One morning, indeed, while putting on his new boots, he asked his chamberlain what they cost; and when he replied, ‘three shillings,’ indignantly, and in a rage, he cried out, ‘You rascal, how long has the King worn boots of so paltry a price? Go, and bring me a pair worth a mark of silver.’ He went, and bringing him a much cheaper pair, told him, falsely, that they cost as much as he had ordered. ‘Aye,’ said the King, ‘these are suitable to royal majesty.’”—IV. 313.

These long, pointed shoes are said to have been invented by Fulk le Rechin, Earl of Anjou, in order to conceal his deformed feet. In this reign, too, the fashionables let their tunics trail on the ground, having wide sleeves, and their mantles were of as rich cloth as they could afford; the upper classes having them trimmed with fur. Thus the Bishop of Lincoln gave Henry I. a mantle lined with fur worth a hundred pounds, or roughly, in our currency, two thousand pounds. Their hair and beards were allowed to grow long until Henry I.

1273]

had his hair cut officially. When they went walking they used either a hood to their mantle, wherewith to cover their heads, or a sort of Phrygian cap, somewhat like the well-known "cap of liberty," or else a wideawake hat with a broad brim, which sometimes had a button on the top. Trousers were worn by the peasants and poor. In a Psalter of the twelfth century (*Lansdowne*, 383) mowers and threshers are at work, stripped to the waist, and only wearing trousers, and in a MS. Giraldus Cambrensis of the thirteenth century (13 B. VII.) a monk is shown, in the scriptorium, wearing trousers. A curious fashion obtained in the time of Henry II. of cutting the edges of garments into various shapes, which came to such excess that in 1188 a statute was passed forbidding anyone wearing cut or jagged garments, but, like other similar laws, it was naturally disregarded. In the first half of the thirteenth century there was little alteration in costume, but the materials were far richer and more expensive, and the use of furs far more general. We first hear of velvet; and the Crusaders, on their return, introduced sendel, which is supposed to have come from Persia; sarcenet, so named from the Saracens; tartan, which was a scarlet woollen cloth; and gauze, said to have been made at Gaza in Palestine: nor must we forget the baudequin, a silk woven with gold, which is supposed to have come from Bagdad. In a romance of Tristram, *temp.* Henry III., Yseult is thus dressed:—

"La roine out de soie dras,	"The queen had silk clothes
Aporté furent de Baudas,	Brought from Bagdad
Forré furent de blanc hermine."	Which were furred with white ermine."

And a curious head-gear was common, called a coif, which was like a baby's cap, tied under the chin. The peasantry, as body clothes, seem only to have worn the tunic, varying in length; and when any head-dress was worn, it was a felt or cloth wideawake; shepherds occasionally having a cloak of rough skin, probably sheepskin. The vestments of the clergy were as nearly as possible those worn by the Roman clergy in England at the present day, with the exception of the mitre, which was much lower.

At the time of the Conquest the dress of a Norman lady resembled in every respect that of her English sister, but, of course, its component parts had different names—the tunic being a *cote*, and the head-covering a *couvre chef*. But

fashion soon began to change; the sleeves got very long at the wrist—so long indeed that they had some times to be tied in a knot in order that they should not be in the way. In the twelfth century the dress was entirely changed. Its component materials were richer, and the bodice cut and laced so as to show the figure; and with the simplicity of the matronly tunic seems to have disappeared also the matronly quietude—that is, if we can believe Neckam,\* who accuses women of loading themselves with jewellery, painting their eyes, puncturing their ears for earrings, of fasting and bleeding themselves so that they should look pale and languishing, of tight-lacing in order to improve their figures, and of dyeing their dark hair yellow. He also† tells us that on a *perch* should hang the lady's chemises, coverchiefs, handkerchiefs, an outer covering cape, mantle, coat, tunic, frock, and surcoat. He also mentions her stays, *garde-corps*, aprons, etc., describes the different needles she required for her different kinds of work, and also her leather thimble. The hair was, during the twelfth century, worn in two long plaits, which either hung down the back, or were brought over the shoulders and depended in front; these plaits being elaborately interwoven with either threads or ribands, and in some instances encased in embroidered silken cases. But in the reign of Henry III. the hair was gathered up and confined in a caul, or net, sometimes made of gold thread. At this date, too, although the *couvre-chef* was worn, the wimple or gorget came into vogue, a modification of which exists to this day in some conventual costumes; and the sleeves were worn so tight that they were laced or sewn on the arms. |

As the Normans were such mighty men of war their arms and armour cannot be passed by without notice; and the Bayeux Tapestry gives a number of examples. From it we see that armour was not donned except on actual service. No gentleman went without his sword, truly, and his retainers carried spear and shield, but he wore no armour. But the shape of the coat of mail worn in war is well known; it consisted of a long-sleeved hauberc or tunic, that opened at the neck and was slit at the skirt, so as to be worn on horseback, with a hood or coif all in one garment, but of what material it was made, whether of leather,

\* *De laude Monachorum.*

† *De Utensilibus.*

canvas, or cloth, is not known. Judging by the tapestry, some of these haubercs were covered with interlinked metal rings, others either of plates of metal sewn or riveted on the tunic, and known by the name of jazerant work, and some seem only to have been quilted. Over the coif was worn the conical helmet, which had a long projection to guard the nose, and thence termed a *nasal*. The shield was shaped like a kite, and appears to have been from two and a half to three and a half feet in length. The arms they bore were spear, sword, and occasionally a mace; but Odo, being Bishop of Bayeux, on the eventful day at Senlac, only carried a *baston*, or club. The spear of a knight bore a pennon, but that of a baron had a "gonfanon" or embroidered and fringed banner. The footmen had short bows, of the use of which the English then knew little, and they very much contributed to the success of that fatal day.

The devices painted on the Norman shields were probably the introduction of rough heraldry into England, and were most likely used so that each man might know his own shield. The devices on those shown in the Bayeux Tapestry are various. Some were only ornamented with bosses, one bears a dragon, another a cross; but the most favourite device was the "fylfot" or "filfat," that mystic symbol of which no one has fathomed the meaning. Used by the ancient Egyptians, by the Chinese for 600 years before Christ, known to the Hindu for the same period as "swastika," found on Greek vases, Bactrian and Danish coins, it also figures in Scandinavian runes as Thor's hammer. Thus we should hardly consider these devices on the Norman shields as heraldic, but leave that for their seals, which were, of course, often used as signatures. As far as we know, neither William I. nor II. nor Henry I. had any device on their shields, and in their great seals, the inside only of their shield is shown. Stephen is *said* to have used a Sagittarius as his badge, but it is not shown on his great seal; in fact, the first English coat-of-arms of which we have any authentic knowledge is Richard I.'s, who bore two lions rampant face to face; and when he returned from captivity, in 1194, he is said to have added another lion, and formed the royal blazon of "three lions or leopards passant gardant." After this period heraldry rapidly became a science, and the devices were hereditary.

About the middle of the twelfth century the shape of the shield changed—the round part of the kite was made a straight line, and the consequence was the triangular shield, which soon became smaller. The use of the bow was kindly taken to by the English, and was soon the national weapon; but the cross-bow was introduced as a military weapon about the end of the twelfth century, previous to which time it had been employed in sporting only. Before leaving this period, it will be well to look at Henry II.'s ordinance as to armour, in 1181. Holinshed says:—

“The King now being returned into England, ordeined a statute for armour and weapons to be had amongst his subjects heere in this realme, which was thus:—Everie man that held a knight's fee should be bound to have a pair of curasses, an helmet, with shield and speare; and everie knight or man at arms should have as many curasses, helmets, shields, and speares as he held knight's fees in demaine. Everie man of the laitie having goods or revenues to the value of sixteen marks, should have one pair of curasses, a helmet, a speare, and a shield. And every free man of the laitie having goods in value worth ten marks, should have a habergeon, a steel cap, and a speare; and all burgesses and the whole communitie of free men should have a wambais,\* a cap of steele, and a speare.”—Ed. 1586, 105 b. 32, *seq.*

Thanks to monumental effigies, whether of carved stone, wood, or incised brass, we are able to see nearly every detail of the armour of the thirteenth century, and note its varying fashions. In the earlier part the knight usually put on first a gambeson, over which he wore a tunic of interlinked chain-mail, made of hammered iron links because the art of wire-drawing was not yet known. This hauberc still had the coif of mail on it for the head, which left only the face exposed, and even the mail mittens were attached to it. A flat-topped helmet was worn over the mail coif. In the second half of the century pieces of plate armour began to appear in the shape of roundels, guarding the shoulders, elbows, and knees; the gloves or the gauntlets were now detached. Below the tunic came the chausses, also of chain mail, made in one piece with the feet, and over all came a loose linen surcoat without sleeves. On a leather sword belt, hung the sword—a straight and somewhat broad-bladed weapon with plain cross-handle, sheathed in a scabbard more or less ornamented.

\* Or gambeson—a quilted sleeveless jacket.



The helm was now worn without the nasal, and either took the older shape, or was a heavy iron heaume resting on the neck, and furnished with slits and holes for sight and ventilation. In the great seals of Henry III. are good examples of the heaume surmounted by a crown, with a barred vizor. In his first great seal this king has rowelled spurs—prick spurs having been hitherto in use.

Tournaments, although known in 1066, were not in use in England until Stephen's reign, and Henry II.

*Tournaments.*

discountenanced them; but when, in 1194, Richard I. returned to England, he revived the tourneys, "for the better training up of souldiers in feats of warre, that they might growe more skiltfull and perfect in the same when they should come to the triall of their forces, whereby he raised no small summes of monie for granting license to his subjects so to tournie." The collection of these licenses, being farmed out, was a source of much exaction. The chivalric amusement of the tourney was revived under Henry III., and when he married Eleanor of Provence in 1236 "Roiall iustes" were held in Tuttle Fields for eight consecutive days. In 1245 a number of lords, knights, and gentlemen assembled between Dunstable and Luton "to have kept martiall iustes and triumphant tornie," but, to their great disappointment, the king forbade it. In 1249 there was a tourney at Brackley in Northamptonshire, where William de Vallence "handled one Sir William de Odingssesles verie roughlie." We hear more of this joust in the relation of another, 1251. "In the feast of the Conception of our Ladie, at a justes holden at Rochester, the strangers were put to the worse, and well beaten by the English batchlers and men-of-arms, so that the dishonour which they did to the Englishmen at Brackley was now recompensed with interest; for the strangers, fleeing to the citie for succour, were met, by the way, by the English knight's servants and yeomen, who fell upon them and beat them sore with clubs and staves, and handled them verie evill." Tilting was not altogether a harmless amusement, as the two following instances will show (1252): "In a justs holden at Walden, Sir Arnold de Monteinie, a right valiant knight, was slaine by Sir Roger de Lemborne, for which mischance all the Nobles there assembled made great lamentation, and namelie the said Sir Roger; but yet he was suspected to be in

blame, because the socket of his staffe was polished, and not abated." 1256 : "In Whitsuntide was holden a great justs at Blie, where the Lord Edward, the King's eldest sonne, first began to show prooffe of his chivalrie. There were diverse overthrowen and hurt, and amongst others, William de Longépee was so brused, that he could never after recover his former strength."

The Norman priests attached to the Army of Conquest sang Psalms, and chanted Litanies and  
**Music.** Misereres all night long before the battle of Senlac ; but, otherwise, the first Norman music which fell upon the ears of the English was the song of Roland shouted aloud by Taillefer as he rushed on them to strike the first blow :—

"Taillefer, ki mult bien cantout,  
 Sor un cheval ki tost alout,  
 Devant li Duc alout cantant  
 De Karlemaine è de Rollant."

Dr. Crotch has printed a tune which he says is the *Chanson de Roland* sung on this occasion ; but, as he gives no authority for his assertion, and as nobody knows any earlier authentic English music (other than that for the services of the Church) than "Sumer is icumen in," which is the first part-song known, and was probably written in the reign of Henry III., it may be regarded as apocryphal. It was at this time that the minstrel proper, the *menestral* or *menetrier*, was coming in. He was a skilled musician, as may be seen by the following Anglo-French poem :—

"Ge sai juglere de *viele* (viol)  
 Si sai de *muse* (bagpipes) et de *frestele* (flageolet or flute),  
 Et de la *harpe* et de *chiphonie* (hurdy-gurdy),  
 De la *gigue* (fiddle), de *larmonie* (tambourine),  
 Et el *salteire* (dulcimer played with the fingers) et en la *rote* (zither)."

And he sang the shorter and lighter *chansons*. Before him was the jongleur, or joglar, and the difference is expressed in the following anecdote :—  
**Minstrels and**  
**Jongleurs.** A minstrel once appeared at a castle gate and asked permission to enter and eat. The porter asked him what he was ; he replied, "God's servant." On this being told the lord of the castle, he said that if that were the case he should not be admitted. When the minstrel heard this he

1273]

took the *rôle* of the jongleur, and said he was the Devil's servant, on which he was told he might enter "because he was a good fellow" (*quia bonus socius erat*). The jongleur sang indeed, and played upon some instruments, but he was a stroller and a vagabond; and having to meet all companies, and earn his living, he supplemented his musical powers by tricks and buffoonery. In a MS. in the British Museum (Add. II., 695) two jongleurs are represented as dancing in very curious clogs; one plays the viol, the other is playing tricks with a peacock, and brandishing a knife. Occasionally they were attached to the household of high personages; as, for instance, Rahere, who founded the priory of St. Bartholomew in Smithfield A.D. 1102, was the king's jongleur. They sang the songs composed by the trouvères or troubadors; and, in the time of Henry III., had fallen into disrepute, the genteeler and more talented *minstrel* being more in accord with the greater civilisation of the times.

The Normans had many musical instruments, the oldest of which, perhaps, was the harp: and the harper was a great personage; for, in 1252, we find that Master Richard, the king's harper, received forty shillings and a pipe of wine, and not only that, but his wife had a pipe of wine given her. It was an instrument of great virtue, if we may credit the following, told of Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, by Robert de Brunne:—

Musical  
Instruments.

"I shall you telle as I have herde  
Of the bysshope seynt Roberde,  
His toname \* is Grosteste,  
Of Lynkolne, so seyth the geste.  
He lovede moche to here the Harpe,  
For mannes wytte it makyth  
    sharpe.  
Next his chaumbre, besyde his  
    study,  
Hys Harper's chaumbre was fast  
    therby.  
Many tymes, by nightes and dayes,  
He hadd solace of notes and layes.  
One askede hem the resun why  
He hadde delyte in Mynstrely:  
He answerde him on thys manere  
Why he helde the Harpe so dere.

'The vertu of the Harpe, thurgh †  
    skylle and ryght,  
Will destrye the fendys ‡ might;  
And to the Cros by gode skeyl  
Ys the Harpe lykened weyl.  
Tharefore, gode men, ye shall lere ||  
Whan ye any Gleman here,  
To wurschep God at your powere,  
As Daudy seyth in the Sautere.  
In harpe and tabour and symphan §  
    gle,  
Wurschep God; in trumps and  
    sautre,  
In cordes, in organes, and bells  
    ringyng.  
In all these wurschepe the hevene-  
    Kyng.'"

\* Surname. † Through. ‡ Fiend's. || Learn. § An instrument.

Organs were early in use, and chimes of small bells (only five) were suspended from a frame and played by means of hammers. Of stringed instruments other than the harp there were the viol, and the gigue or fiddle, the psaltery or shawm, which was a dulcimer played with a plectrum (sometimes two) or with the fingers, and the rote (zither or cittern). Of wind instruments besides the organ they had the horn, and probably the trumpet, bagpipes, and the flageolet. The drum and tabor also were theirs, and that peculiar instrument the hurdy-gurdy. Cymbals do not appear in illustrations until later, but were doubtless in use.

Of the house furniture of the Normans we have very little pictorial illustration. The Bayeux Tapestry  
**Furniture.** supplies us with backed seats generally made to accommodate two, occasionally more, and these are furnished with cushions, and accompanied with footstools, a throne being only a higher seat than ordinary. A semi-circular table is also shown, where the bishop, who sits in the centre, blesses the food and drink—whilst a servitor does his work on bended knee. The few illustrated English MSS. of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries do not add much to our knowledge. A few chairs are shown, mostly with legs and backs turned in blocks alternately square and round; some, especially those used in the Scriptorium, or by ecclesiastical dignitaries, are made with pierced panel-work, as are also the very low beds then used, which were without bed-posts or curtains. It was usual to go to bed naked, but in one MS. (Nero C. iv.) of the twelfth century, St. Joseph is depicted as wearing a night-shirt. There are no trustworthy illustrations of the interior of a room; but Neckam tells us how a bedroom should be ordered. He says that in a chamber the walls should be hung with curtains or tapestry, in order to avoid flies and spiders, and that hangings should also depend from the architrave. Near the bed a chair should be placed (presumably at the head), and at the foot should be a bench on which the person going to bed might sit. Upon the bedstead a feather bed should be placed, together with a bolster. This should be covered with a short sheet, or narrow covering, over which should be placed a handsome cloth on that part upon which the head rests. Over this should be sheets of sendel or silk, or even of linen or blanket. These

1273]

should be covered with a counterpane of green, say, or yew-coloured stuff, bordered with skins of cat, beaver, or marten.

Of sitting-rooms, as we know them, there were none—a lady receiving her guests, of both sexes, in her bed-room; and, as is represented in later MSS., sitting on the bed, giving her chair to the guest. For the furniture of a hall we must go to a much later vocabulary, and deduct many things, as luxuries, which had crept in since the twelfth century. There were a table, trestles, bankers, and dossers (cloths to cover the benches), table cloths, a table *dormaunt* (a fixed or permanent table), a basin and ewer, hearth with fire burning, together with logs, and irons and tongs, a pair of bellows, a long settle (seat with back and arms), a chair, a bench, a side table, lectern for reading, and a screen. Little enough—but far too luxurious for the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

Travelling must have been painful and slow work. The roads, with the exception of the fine Roman roads, were very bad, and gentlefolk Roads and Travel. travelled on horseback—and that at a slow pace—stopping every now and then at some inn or monastery for rest. The gentry's horses were good, for the Norman, like a true *chevalier*, loved his *destrier*. The ladies rode either small horses or mules, and mostly sat sideways. The chariots in use were neither more nor less than springless carts, and they were very rare and only used by the nobility. Indeed, Mathew Paris remarks, speaking of Thomas à Becket's splendid equipage when, in 1158, he went to France to escort to England Henry II.'s son's bride, Margaret, daughter of the King of France, that he had nine chariots. In Walter de Biblesworth's vocabulary, he says:—

“Io vey cy venter une charette;  
Bon est ke m'entremette  
En Fraunceys la charette descrivere  
E pur enfaunz mettre en liviere.”—*Mayer*, I., 167.

And he goes on metrically to describe its component parts, its wheels, with the tires, felloes, spokes, hub, and axle, etc., etc. Men were perforce compelled to travel, not for commercial, but for warlike, legal, or religious reason; and the kings were continually making progresses, and holding parliaments in various cities and towns.

## AUTHORITIES.—1216-1273.

## GENERAL.

For the long reign of Henry III. there is a good supply of contemporary writers. The important St. Alban's Chronicles, compiled successively by Wendover, Matthew Paris, and Rishanger, go down to 1306. The monastic annals of Waverley, Dunstable, Osney, etc., are full and important. A valuable series of royal letters, selected and edited in the Rolls' Series, covers the reign. In the same series are Grosseteste's *Letters*, the *Monumenta Franciscana*, and Roger Bacon's works. Thomas Wykes gives the royalist view; the important *Carmen de Bello Lewensi* (ed. Kingsford), and the mass of contemporary political songs give the reformers' ideas. Constitutional documents are very fully given in Stubbs' *Charters*. Modern authorities as for chap. iii., also Blauw, *Barons' War*, and Prothero's *Simon de Montfort*.

## SPECIAL SUBJECTS.

*Religion* (see also above).—The Chronicles of Robert of Gloucester and Matthew Paris (Rolls' Series); political songs of the period; and the works of Roger Bacon; *Monumenta Franciscana* (ed. J. S. Brewer); Eccleston's *Coming of the Friars*.

*Law*.—The best text of the statutes is in the edition issued by the Record Commission. Stubbs' select *Charters* and Bémont's *Chartes* are useful. Various judicial rolls have been published by the Selden Society and the Surtees Society. The best of the three editions of Bracton's *Law of England* is that of 1569. Bracton's *Note Book* (ed. Maitland) contains many of the cases on which he based his text. The best sketch of the material is given by Brunner in Holtzendorff's *Encyklopädie der Rechtswissenschaft*. Reeves' *History of English Law* begins to be useful in this period. See also J. F. Stephen's *History of Criminal Law*; Pike's *History of Crime*; and Blackstone's *Commentaries*.

Warfare and Naval matters, as for chap. iii.

*Agriculture* (for period 1216-1348).—Thorold Rogers, *History of Agriculture and Prices*, and *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*; Nasse, *Zur Geschichte der Mittelalterlichen Feldgemeinschaft in England*; Vinogradoff, *Villainage in England*; Maitland, *Select Pleas in Manorial Courts* (Selden Society); Seeböhm, *English Village Community*; Gomme, *Village Community*.

*Commerce, etc.*—Cunningham, *History of Industry and Commerce*, i.; Ashley, *Economic History*; Thorold Rogers, *Agriculture and Prices*, i., ii.; Hall, *History of the Customs Revenue*, i., ii.; Madox, *History of the Exchequer*; Gross, *The Gild Merchant: Monumenta Gildhallae* (ed. Riley, Rolls' Series); Jacobs, *Jews in Angevin England*.

*Art and Architecture*.—As for chap. iii., omitting Freeman's *History of the Norman Conquest*, and adding Kenyon, *Gold Coins of England*.

*Learning and Science*.—Besides the works of Hampden, Bass Mullinger, Maxwell Lyte, and Poole, referred to in chap. iii., mention may be made of J. S. Brewer's prefaces to his edition of *Monumenta Franciscana*, 1858, and of Roger Bacon's *Opera Inedita*, 1869; H. R. Luard, preface to *Roberti Grosseteste Epistole*, 1861; T. M. Lindsay, *Occam* (*Encycl. Brit.*, 9th ed., xvii.); A. Seth, *Scholasticism* (*Encycl. Brit.*, 9th ed., xxi.); Rashdall, *Origin of the University of Oxford* (*Church Quarterly Review*, No. 46, Jan., 1887), and introduction to *The Friars Preachers v. the University, 1311-1313* (in Oxford Historical Society's *Collectanea*, 2nd series, 1890); A. G. Little, *The Grey Friars in Oxford*, 1892; Brodrick, *Memorials of Merton College*, 1885.

*Language and Literature* (see also list appended to chap. iii.).—Skeat, *Principles of English Etymology* (two series, Clarendon Press, 1887-91); Sweet, H., *New English Grammar*, part i. (Clarendon Press, 1892); B. Ten Brink, *Chaucer's Sprache und Verskunst*, Leipzig, 1884; Kluge, *Gesch. d. Englischen Sprache* (in Paul's *Grundriss*

1273]

*der Germanischen Philologie*, I.) ; H. G. Hewlett, *Cronica Rogeri de Wendover, sire Flores Historiarum* (3 vols., 1886, etc., Rolls' Series) ; Sir F. Madden, *Matthaei Parisiensis Historia Anglorum sire . . . Historia Minor* (3 vols., 1886-9, Rolls' Series) ; H. R. Luard, *Matthaei Parisiensis Cronica Majora* (1872-82, 7 vols., Rolls' Series), and the other chroniclers edited in the Rolls' Series ; *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Art. "Romance." H. Ward, *Introduction to Romance Catalogue*, British Museum.

*Social Life*.—Besides the works quoted above and in the appendix to chap. iii., the following may be mentioned :—Walter de Bibbesworth, in *A Library of National Antiquities*, I., ed. by J. Mayer, Liverpool, 1857 (privately printed) ; Neckam, *de Utensilibus* (*ibid.*) ; Lacroix, *Military and Religious Life*, London, 1874 ; Raimet, *La Costume Historique*, Paris, 1876 ; *Histoire de la Chaussure*, Paris, 1880 ; Shaw, *Dresses and Decorations of the Middle Ages*, London, 1843 ; H. Hall, *Court Life under the Plantagenets*, London, 1890 ; Hon. A. H. Dillon, *Costume in England*, London, 1885 ; Chappell, *The Ballad Literature and Popular Music of the Olden Time*, London, 1885-9 ; R. Warner, *Antiquitates Culinariae*, London, 1791. *Archæologia*, vol. xli., *Dissertation on Ancient and Mediæval Cookery* (Coote). *The Forms of Chury*, compiled about 1390 (ed. S. Pegge, 1780), refers to a rather later period.





# INDEX.

- Abailard (or Abelard), Peter, 333  
Acre, Siege of, 317  
Adam of Marsh, 405, 438  
Adam of Petitpont, 342  
Addison, xli.  
Adelard of Bath, 340, 347  
Admiral of the Fleet, King John's ordinance for the, 319  
Ælfric, 192  
Æthelbert, his reception of Augustine, 155, 156, 217; his baptism, 156; laws of, 165, 167; assists Augustine to restore Canterbury Cathedral, 196  
Æthelred (*see* Ethelred)  
Æthelstan, coins of the time of, 200  
Agricola, Julius, arrives in Britain, 8, 22; his methods of civilisation, 54; his invasion of Caledonia, 60; the success of his conciliatory measures in Britain, 102  
Agriculture, early British, 87; old English, 123, 208-210, 214; after the Norman Conquest, 356, 357; productivity and cost in mediæval times, 358; general improvement of 13th and 14th centuries, 450; number of labourers employed in, 452; books on, 455  
Aidan, 154, 158  
Alamans, the, 117  
Albinus, D. Clodius, 13  
Aldermen, 134, 138, 147  
Alexander of Hales, 406, 437  
Alfred, King, his war-ships, 139, 141, 161; his laws, 167; his military improvements, 182; his translations, xxxi., 192; his navy and embassies to Jerusalem, 202; proverbs under his name, 448  
Almsgiving in early British Church, 41  
"Amis and Amiloun," 450  
Amphitheatres, 24, 82  
Amusements of Anglo-Saxons, 225; of Londoners, 377, 378  
Anchorites, 408  
Anderida, 133  
Anecdotes (*see* Stories and Legends)  
Angels, belief in, 474  
Angles, Teutonic, in Britain, 3 (*see* Englas)  
Anglesey, Norse descent on, 3, 25; invasion of, 35; Earls of Shrewsbury and Chester's descent upon, 309  
Anglo-Norman language, 442, 443  
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (*see* Chronicle)  
Anglo-Saxon Language (*see* Language)  
Animals, domestic, 87, 475  
Animals, wild, 90, 92, 465  
Anselm, attacked by William II., 245; his appointment to the See of Canterbury, 253; his contest with Henry I., 254; takes part in the Trinitarian controversy, 333; his synod on the celibacy question, 384  
Antonine's Wall, 55  
Aque Sulis (*see* Bath)  
Aquinas, St. Thomas, his philosophical position, 437  
Archery of the Normans, 299  
Architecture, of early Britain, 68; Romano-British, 73; Roman domestic, 77; sacred, 82, 83; of Anglo-Saxons, 196-199; Norman ecclesiastical, 320-324; transition to Early English, in 12th century, 325-327; Norman secular, 328-330; Norman domestic, 330; of Henry III.'s reign, 415-427; of Salisbury Cathedral, 416  
Architecture, naval, improvements after Norman Conquest, 310  
Ardoch, Fort at, 57, 61  
Aristo, xl.  
Aristotle, study of, at the universities, 435, 436  
Arithmetic, 333  
Armour of Romans, 62; of Normans, 300, 482, 483, 484  
Army, of Old English king, 139; of Harold, 299; of William the Conqueror, 299, 300 (*see also* Warfare)  
Art, independence of earliest stages of, xix.; rise and development of, xlii.-xlii.; earliest traces of British, 64, 65; in the Bronze Age, 66, 67; Romano-British, 73, 75; Anglo-Saxon, 193-195; ecclesiastical, of the 13th century, 417-424  
Arthur, King, 8, 121  
"Arthur and Merlin," 450  
Arthur, Prince, 264  
Artists, payments to, in 13th century, 419  
Aryan tribesmen, characteristics of, xxii.  
Ascham, xl.  
Assessment of taxes, 396  
Assize of Arms, 411  
Assizes of Henry II., 262, 277, 289  
Astronomy, 333  
Athletic exercises, 112, 475  
Attrebates, the, 98  
Augustine, his arrival in Kent, 154; restores Canterbury Cathedral, 196, 197; his reception in England by Queen Bertha, 217  
Augustinian Hermits, 432  
Augustodunum (*see* Autun)  
Augustus, Emperor, 11; worshippers of 15  
Aurelianus, Ambrosius, 119  
Austin Friars, 432  
Authorities, 114, 115, 228, 388, 490  
Autun, school for lawyers at, 24  
Avebury, stone circle of, 68  
Bacon, Roger, xxxi., 406, 433; as an original investigator and critic, 438  
Bacon, Francis, his services in the cause of learning and science, xxxiii.  
Badonicus, Mons, 120, 121  
Bakers, 467; fraudulent, 479  
"Balance of Trade," 365  
Balliol College, and its founder, 434  
Bamborough, 130  
Bards, the, their influence on letters and language, xix.; 103, 110  
Barons' war, the, 393-395  
Barrows, 66  
Barter, 212; in the 13th century, 459  
Base coin, 387  
Basnets, 485  
Bath, 16, 27, 62, 82, 133  
Baths, Roman, 82, 93; Anglo-Saxon, 227

- "Battle of Finnsburg," 190  
 Battle of Lewes, 395; of Evesham, 395;  
     of Lincoln, 301  
 "Battle of Maldon," 190  
 "Battle of the Standard," 258, 301, 411  
 Baudequin, 481  
 Bayeux Tapestry, 304, 380, 386, 411, 474,  
     478, 480, 483, 488  
 Beacons, 414  
 Beads of early Britains, 70, 88  
 Beards, 480  
 Becket, 257; his quarrel with Henry II.,  
     and exile, 259, 260, 270; his early life,  
     269; his work in law-reform, 269;  
     his purification of the Church, 270;  
     his friends in exile, 270; returns to  
     England, 270; his murder, 270; his  
     high reputation, 271  
 Bede, 257; summary of his life and  
     work, 154; his "*Historia Ecclesiastica  
     Gentis Anglorum*," 154; his allu-  
     sion to the effects of pestilence upon  
     religion, 175; his allusion to foreign  
     glass-makers, 193  
 Beds in early Britain, 4, 5, 114; of Anglo-  
     Saxons, 223, 224; of Normans, 488  
 Beer, 92, 124, 215, 477, 479  
 Bees, 87, 359  
 Belgæ, the, 98, 99  
 Benedict, 197  
 Benefit of Clergy, 297, 298  
 Benefit societies of the Middle Ages,  
     364  
 Bentley, Richard, xxxiv.  
 "Beowulf," xxxviii., 151, 152, 153, 177, 185,  
     188, 189, 210  
 Berengar of Tours, 332, 333  
 "Bestiary," Tíbaldu's, 447  
 Beverley Minster, 424  
 Bignor, mosaics at, 81, 94  
 Bills of exchange, introduction of, 365,  
     387  
 Birinus, 157  
 Bishoprics, in Britain, 37, 157; Augus-  
     tine's, 157; Theodore's, 160  
 Bishops, temporal power of, 384  
 Black, Joseph, xxiv.  
 Black Death, the, 1, 174, 175, 457  
 Blood-feuds, 5, 171  
 Boadicea, tortures inflicted by, 21; her  
     rebellion defeated by Suetonius  
     Paulinus, 54, 60, 101  
 Boldon Book, the, 360  
 Bologna, Schools of, 342  
 Bonaventura, 406  
 Bootless offences, 137  
 Boots and shoes, 480  
 Boroughs, of the Dane-law, 145; Anglo-  
     Saxon, 206, 362; their progress in the  
     11th and 12th centuries, 257, 362;  
     their growth in political importance  
     after 1213, 396; their representation  
     in De Montfort's Parliament, 399  
 Boston Fair, 464  
 Boulogne, 22  
 Boyle, Robert, xxxiv.  
 Bracton's law-book, 284  
 Bradford-on-Avon, Anglo-Saxon church  
     at, 198  
 Brading, Roman villa at, 79, 94  
 Bran, and the introduction of Christian-  
     ity into Britain, 36  
 Bretwalda, the, 8, 132  
 Brick-making, 93  
 Bridges, maintenance of, 366  
 Bridport, Bishop, finishes the building  
     of Salisbury Cathedral, 416  
 Brigantes, the, 7, 27, 99, 100  
 Bristol, slave-trade of, 204, 205; as a com-  
     mercial port in the reign of Henry  
     II., 311  
 Britain, first immigrants in, 1; Celtic  
     conquest of, 2; Teutonic invasions  
     of, 2, 3; tribesmen and villagers of  
     early, 3-6; Roman conquest of, 7, 8,  
     11, 53; divisions and fortresses of  
     Romans in, 8; Roman influence and  
     prestige in, 10, 11; allusion of Tacitus  
     to people of, 11; independence of  
     northern parts of, 12; Roman govern-  
     ment of, 12-18; advantages of Roman  
     rule in, 18-20; progress of civilisation  
     in, 19, 54; Roman taxation in, 20-22;  
     the conscription in, 22; adoption of  
     Roman ideas and habits in, 23, 24;  
     religion under the Romans in, 25-29,  
     74; introduction of Christianity and  
     its development in, 36-42; military  
     organisation of primitive races of,  
     43, 44, 46; Celtic roads in, 49, 50;  
     Celtic modes of warfare in, 51, 52;  
     Roman walls in, 55; Roman roads  
     in, 54; Roman military system in,  
     56-64; early art and architecture,  
     64-84; trade and industry in Celtic,  
     84-90; industry and trade under the  
     Romans in, 90-97; withdrawal of  
     Romans from, 98; social life and  
     manners in Celtic and Roman, 98-  
     114; under Carausius and other kings,  
     116-118; under tribal kings, 118, 119;  
     English conquest of, 116-120 (*see also*  
     England)  
*Britannia*, Roman province of, 13:  
     divisions of, 13  
 "British Pompeii," 17  
 Brittany (*see* Brythons)  
 Bronze, introduction of, 66, 86  
 Browne, Sir Thomas, xli.  
 Brunanburh, Battle of, 183  
 "Brut," the, of Layamon, xxxviii.  
 Brythons in Britain, 2, 30; in Brittany, 2  
 Burgesses, 396, 399  
 Burial, of Anglo-Saxons, 228; in the 13th  
     century, 474  
 Byland Abbey, 325  
  
 Cædmon, xxx., xxxviii.; poems of, 191  
 Caerleon-upon-Usk, 17, 62  
 Cæsar, Julius, petitioned by British  
     kings, 7; 10, 11; his identification of  
     Celtic with Roman deities, 30, 31;  
     his conquest of Britain, 53, 98  
 Caldonii, The, 23  
 Caligula, 99  
 Cambridge, fairs at, 365 (*see also* Uni-  
     versity of Cambridge)  
 Camps of primitive races, 46; of Ro-  
     mans, 56  
 Camulodunum (or Camalodunum), 7, 14,  
     16, 26, 62, 98 (*see also* Colchester)  
 Cannabæ, 17  
 Canon Law, 281, 282  
 Canterbury, St. Martin's Church, 83;  
     first Archbishop of, 159; School of,  
     342, 343  
 Canterbury Cathedral, restored by Au-  
     gustine and Æthelbert, 196; additions  
     of Cuthbert and Odo, 196, 197; its de-  
     struction by fire, 197; rebuilding  
     (c. 1110), 323; destroyed by fire (1174),  
     324; rebuilt by William of Sens,  
     325; first English Archbishop of, 159  
 Canute, 135, 147; made king in North-  
     umbria and Mercia, 148; his in-  
     fluence in Denmark, 149; the pro-  
     gress during his reign, 163; laws of,  
     168; his military improvements, 184;  
     his building of churches, 198  
 Caracalla, Emperor, 20  
 Caractacus, 7, 9, 53; betrayed by Cartis-

- mandua, and carried in triumph to Rome, 100
- Carausius, 116
- Carlisle, 18
- Carmelites, 432
- Cartismandua, 100
- Cassivelaunus, 7, 9, 53, 98
- Castles, of the Normans, xliv., 301, 303; their architecture and plan, 328-330; rooms of, 382; of Henry III.'s reign, 425
- Cathedrals, rebuilding of, by Norman clergy, 320
- Cattle, 72, 212, 213, 357; profits from rearing, 459
- Catuvelauni, the, 7
- Cavalry, of the Normans, 299
- Cave-men, 61
- Cavendish, Henry, xxxiv.
- Celibacy, clerical, 163, 220; Anselm's synod for the enactment of, 384
- Celts, contrasted with Iberians, xxii.; Christian Church of the, xxv.; in early Britain, 1; divisions of, 2; 9, 10, 30; their gods, 30-32; their roads, 49, 50; their frontier defences, 51; their introduction of bronze, 66
- Cemeteries, 228
- Censitor*, the, 15
- Cerdic, 208
- Chancery Courts, germ of, 262
- "Chanson de Roland," 346, 347
- Chapter-house of Westminster, 418
- Chapter-houses, architecture of, in Norman times, 330, 419
- Charettes, 489
- Chariots, scythe-axled, 52, 86, 98; Roman, 60
- Charms, 25
- Charter, The Great, signed at Runnymede, 267; the foundation of English law, 409; its modifications, 410
- Charter of Henry I., 267
- Charter of William I., to London, 362, 372
- Château Gaillard, 303
- Chaucer, xxxix.; source of his "Man of Lawe's Tale," 447
- Cheese, 459
- Chester, 17, 27, 62, 205, 361
- Chichester (Regnum), 11
- Children, among early Britons, 106; Anglo-Saxon, and of the 13th century, 474
- Chillingham Cattle, progenitors of, 72
- Chimney-flues, 426
- Christ Church, Oxford, xxxiii.
- Christianity in Britain, 29; its introduction into Britain, 36, 37; bishoprics of, 37; its monasteries, 38; its doctrine and worship, 39; its liturgy, 40; its buildings, 41; its endowments, 41; after the English conquest, 141, 142, 146; its condition on the arrival of Augustine, 155; Augustine's mission for its extension, 154-158, 217; its progress impeded by hostility of British bishops to Gregory's proposals, 157; missions of Birinus, Aidan, and Theodore for its extension, 157-161
- Church, English, its founders, xxv., 154-160; its conflict with the Crown in 12th century, xxvi.; early characteristics, 155; its decadence, 161; its revival, 254; crusades of the, in Stephen's reign, 258; extension of the courts of the, 269; scandals of the 12th century in the, 271; under the Normans, 383; work of the Friars in strengthening the, 406; its toleration towards the Jews, 407; influence in rural districts in 13th century, 407; under Alfred and Dunstan, 162; its retrogression, 163; its improvement under Canute, 163; under William I., 250-252; investitures in, 254.
- Chronicle, Old English, 229, 348, *seqq.*
- Church of Rome, its exactions from England in 13th century, 403
- Church and State, xxvi.; under William I., 250
- Churches, of early Britain, 41, 82, 83; of Anglo-Saxons, 197; rebuilding of, by Norman clergy, 320; their architecture in Norman times, 321-327; number in London in 12th century, 366
- Cinque Ports, 206, 411, 469
- Cirencester, 17, 98
- Citizens, 383
- Citizenship, rights of, 20
- Civil organisation of primitive races, xxii.
- Clarendon, Earl of, xl.
- Class representation, 402
- Classical learning in the 12th century, 386, 387
- Claudius, Emperor, 14, 22, 53, 99
- Clemens Maximus, 117
- Clergy in early British Church, influence of, 42; their connection with the State in the English Church, 162; taxation of, 262; celibacy of, 384; enactment for their protection, 384, 385; convocations of, 401; their protest against the exactions of Rome, 403
- Climate of Britain, 91
- Cloth used by early Britons, 87; manufacture of, in 13th century, 466
- Clothing, cost of, in the time of Richard II., liii.; of early Britons, 87, 102, 113; manufacture of, in 13th century, 465
- Clovishooch, Council of, 161
- Cnut (*see* Canute)
- Coal, 92
- Cock-fighting, 377
- Cogidubnus, 11
- Coins, of British chiefs, 11, 86; of Britanno-Roman towns, 16; of Celts, 70; of Romans, 83; of Anglo-Saxons, 199; in Norman times, 331, 332, 387; of Henry III., 427, 428
- Colchester, signs presaging the destruction of the city, 19, *note*; treatment of original dwellers by the Romans, 21; its early name, 26; the founding of, 101; Castle of, 329, 330
- Colet, Dean, foundation of St. Paul's School by, xxxii.
- Coloni, 125
- Colonia Victricensis, 14
- Comes Britanniarum, 14, 61, 132
- Comes Litoris Saxonici, 14, 117
- Comitatus, the, 134, 177
- Commot, the, 7
- Communa, the, 399
- Communism among villagers, 6, 358
- Communitas scirae, the, 399
- Compurgators, 286
- Concilium Sapientium, the, 136
- Congreve, xli.
- Conscription in Britain under Roman rule, 22
- Constantine the Great, 117, 146
- Constantius, 116
- Conservation of energy, xxxvii.
- Consulares, 13
- Convocations, 396, 401
- Cookery, 112, 113, 124
- Copper, 92
- Coracles, 88, 90
- Cordwainers, 467
- Corinium (*see* Cirencester)
- Corn, exports of, 91; its export prohibited

- by Richard I., 365; price of, in 1316, 451; produce of, in 13th century, 452; tallying, 459; selling and bartering, 459; importation from Germany and Holland of, 472; famine prices of, 473
- Cornwall, Earl of, 472
- Corporations, 93
- Costume, of early Britons, 87, 102; of Anglo-Saxons, 222; of Normans, 480
- Cottar's right, 126
- Cottiers, 357; holdings of, 360
- Council of Sens, 333
- Councils, Town, 15
- Councils, Village, 125
- Counsellors among old English, 134
- Craftsmen among the old English, 129; immigration of, at the Norman Conquest, 361; of the 13th century, 465
- Creed of early Christian Church in Britain, 39
- Cremation, 69, 109
- Crime in early Britain, 5; punishment of, among old English, 137
- Crocus, King of the Alamans, 117
- Cross-bow, introduction of, 302; superseded by the long-bow, 411, 484
- Crown, control of trade by the, 469, 470; regulation of Jewish money-dealings by the, 471
- Crusades (1147), 259; effect of, on architecture of England, 323; effect on trade, 385, 461
- Crusades of the Church in Stephen's reign, 258
- Culture, English, work of the friars in promoting, 406
- "Cuckoo's Song," 448
- Cunobelinus, 7
- Curfew-bell, 373
- Curiales*, 15
- Customs dues of the 13th century, 470
- Cymbeline (*see* Cunobelinus)
- Cynewulf, King of West Saxons, 135
- Cynewulf, Northumbrian bard, 187; poems of, 191, 192
- Cyprus, conquest of, 315
- Dairy produce in Middle Ages, 359; in 13th century, 459
- "Dame Sirez," 450
- Dancing, 475
- Dane-law, the, 145
- Danegeld tax, the, 307
- Danes, invasions of, 140, 180, 181; influence on England of, 149; their mode of warfare, 180, 181; their dress, 223; their fleets, 210
- Dapifer, the, 476
- Darwin's "Origin of Species," xxxvi.
- David of Scotland, 301
- Decapitation, 314
- Decuriones*, 15
- Defensor civitatis*, the, 15
- Degrees, academical, 338
- Deva (*see* Chester)
- Dialectic, 333
- Diaper in architecture, 417
- Dinner, amongst the Normans, 476, 477
- Dioeceses* of Britain, 13
- Diocletian, Britain under, 13
- Dobuni, the, 98
- Dockyards, 318, 411
- Dogs, 87, 92, 110, 379
- Domesday Book, 236-240, 356, 373
- Domesday of St. Paul's, 360
- Domestic implements of early Britain, 43
- Dominicans, 404, 431
- Dominus*, the, 125
- Domus communitatum*, 399
- Doomsmen, 286
- Dorchester (Dorset), 17, 24, 61
- Dover, 22
- Dress and fashion in Norman times, 480-482
- Drinking-vessels, 72, 224
- Druidism, 10, 25, 28; the hierarchy of, 33; sacred rites of, 34; teaching of, 35; its decline, 35, 36; children instructed in, 108
- Drunkenness, 112, 226, 374, 377
- Dryden, xli.
- Dubree (*see* Dover)
- Dumnobellaunus, 11
- Dungeons in castles, 382
- Duns Scotus, 406; his philosophical position, 436; general character of his teaching, 439
- Dunstan, his reforms in the English Church, 161, 162; his numerous accomplishments, 208, 220; his reorganisation of monasteries, 220
- Durham Cathedral, Galilee porch of, 325
- Durnovaria (*see* Dorchester)
- Dumvir*, title of, 15
- Dux Britanniarum*, 8, 15, 61, 117, 132
- Dwellings, Celtic, 70; of villans, 381; of peasants in 13th century, 466
- Dyes, 88, 102
- Dymchurch, 93
- Dyrham, 130
- Eadred, 146
- Eadwine, 152
- Eagle, Roman, at Strathfieldsaye, 63
- Earls, 148
- Easter, origin of name, 152; Scottish mode of calculating, 155; Augustine's proposal to the British Church for calculating, 157; King Oswy's synod to determine its calculation, 159
- Easterlings, the, 460
- Eating-houses, 478, 479
- Eboracum (*see* York)
- Edgar, Emperor of all Britain, 141; his work of consolidating the English Church, 163
- Edgar (grandson of Edmund Ironside), his maritime expedition to the Holy Land, 310
- Edmund (son of Harold), 308
- Edmund I. (the elder), transfers Cumberland to the King of Scots, 146; 147
- Edmund Ironside, 148
- Edric, 232, 233
- Education, in the 12th century, 337-343, 379, 380; work of the friars in, 406; of boys in the 13th century, 474; of girls in the 13th century, 475
- Edward the Confessor, 163; laws of, 169
- rebuilds Westminster Abbey, 199
- Edward I., 396, 409
- Edwin, 157, 179
- Egbert, 179, 182
- Elders among the old English, 134
- Electricity, xxxv.
- Elphege, Archbishop, 163
- Ely Book, the, 356
- Ely Cathedral, 322, 327
- Embroidery, gold, 194, 380
- Enamel work, 380
- Engines of war, 315
- England: English conquest, 116-132; first legal institutions, 134; kings and *comitatus*, 134; the *witenagemot* and *folk moot*, 136; early local government, 138; early army and navy, 139; Scandinavian settlements, 140-148; Danish kings in 11th century, 148; paganism, 149-153; early Christian

- Church, 153-164; first legal code, 165; laws of Ine, Alfred, Canute, and Edward, 167-172; public health, 6th to 11th century, 173-176; early military organisation, 176-180; influence of the Danes, 180-184; early literature, 184-193; early art and architecture, 193-201; early trade and industry, 201-210; social life and manners to the Norman Conquest, 210-228; Norman Conquest, 231-236; Domesday Book, 236-240; the new Norman landowners, 240-243; under William Rufus and Henry I., 244-247, 253-255; the anarchy of Stephen's reign, 257; growth of royal power in the reign of Henry II., 261; legal reforms in, 262, 279, 280; constitutional progress, 262; the reign of John and the Great Charter, 264-267; growth of monasticism, 268; reformers of the Church, 273; change in military organisation, 300; navy and merchant service of the 12th century, 308-319; architecture of the Normans, 319-332; learning, science, and literature of the 12th century, 332-343; its trade and wealth in the 12th century, 360-367, 386, 387; lepers, 367-370; social life in Norman times, 371-380; genesis of the Parliament, 396-403; coming of the friars, xxvii., 405; growing influence of the Church, 406-408; duties of the Cinque Ports, 412; progress of the Navy in reign of Henry III., 413, 414; building of Salisbury Cathedral and decoration of Westminster Abbey, 416-418; sculpture of the 13th century, 420; the beginning of the Universities, 429-440; language and literature of the 13th century, 440-450; agriculture from 1216-1348, 450-457; trade and industry of the 13th century, 457-472; health and social life of the 13th century, 472-489
- Englas, the, 119; their settlements in England, 131, 177
- English Chronicle (*see* Chronicle)
- Enlistment for the Navy, 318
- Estates, the Three, 402
- Ethelbert (*see* Aethelbert)
- Ethelfleda, the "Lady of London," 136; her resistance to Danes, 145; her war with the South Welsh, 146
- Ethelfleda (kinswoman of Dunstan), her burial, 228
- Ethelred, or Aethelred, 135, 147, 148; laws of, 168; wars of, 183
- Ethelstan (*see* Aethelstan)
- Ethnology of England, 1, 48, 64-65, 130-133
- Evil spirits, seeing, 408
- Evolution of national life, xvi.
- Exchequer, beginnings of an, 276
- Exeter, 205
- Exogamy, 216
- "Fair of Lincoln," 391
- Fairies and demons, 32, 33
- Fairs, 140, 208, 365; in the 13th century, 462
- Family life in early Britain, 4, 5, 103, 111
- Famine, of 1316-17, 451, 472; of 1439, 473, 479
- Famine-pestilences, 175, 176; in the Middle Ages, 370, 371, 472, 479
- Farmers' rights, 127
- Farming, mixed, of the 13th and 14th centuries, 453
- 'awkes de Breauté, 391, 392
- Feudalism, 236, 259
- Fines of early English law, 166, 171
- Fisher's duties among old English, 129
- Fishery rights of kings, 308
- Fitz Osborne, William, 476
- Fitz Stephen, William, his account of the social condition of London, 376, 377
- Fitzherbert, Sir Anthony, treatise on agriculture by, 456
- Flag of England, 315
- Flanders, English trade with, 460
- Fleet, Roman-British, 22; Danish, 210; Norman, 304-307
- Flemish artisans, 467
- "Floris and Blancheflor," 450
- Folk-kings, 134
- Folk-moot, 125, 134, 136; place of meeting and proceedings of, 137, 205
- Folk-right, 170
- Food, 112, 113, 124, 207; of Anglo-Saxons, 225, 226; of the 13th century, 475
- Football, 377
- Foreign influence, English hatred of, 392
- Forest law, 410
- Forests, 90
- Fortification, art of, in Norman times, 303
- Fortresses of the Normans, 300, 323
- Forts of primitive races, 47, 85; of Romans, 57
- Fowler's duties among the old English, 129
- Franchise, the right to the, 402
- Franciscans, 405, 431-433
- Frank-pledge, 139
- Franka, the, 116, 117
- Fraomarius, King, 117
- Free and unfree workers among the old English, 128
- Free tenants, 356
- Free trade in Norman times, 362
- French, as the legal language of England, 279; its influence on the English language, 443, 444
- Fresco painting, 417, 419
- Friars, the coming of the, xxvii., 404, 432; work of the, 405, 406; they intercede for the Jews, 407; their influence at the Universities, 434
- Frisians, the, 119, 132
- Fulk le Rechin, 480
- Fullers, 467
- Funeral rites of early Britons, 109; of Anglo-Saxons, 228
- Furniture of Anglo-Saxon houses, 223, 224; of Normans, 488
- Gaels in Britain, 2
- Galleys, 315
- Gambesons, 484
- Garnier, 271
- Gaul, intercourse with Britain, 89
- Gauze, 481
- Gebur (small farmer), rights of, 127
- Geneat (peasant), rights of, 126
- Geoffrey of Monmouth, 349, 353
- Geometry, 333
- Geotas (Jutes), 119; their settlements in England, 131
- Gerald of Wales, 342
- Gcsiths, 135, 139, 177, 182
- Gesoriacum (*see* Boulogne)
- Giants, 153
- Gilbert of Sempringham, 268
- Gilbert, William, xxxiv.
- Gildas, his denunciation of the five wanton steeds, 120; his description of the condition of the British Church, 155



- Gilds, of merchants, 93, 362, 363, 386, 466 ;  
     of craftsmen, 363, 364, 467  
 Giraldus Cambrensis, literary works of  
     352, 371, 411 ; on the luxurious living  
     of the monks, 477  
 Glanvill, Ranulf, 283  
 Glass, beads of, in early Britain, 70 ; im-  
     ported after Roman Conquest, 72 ;  
     manufactured in Britain, 83, 92, 193 ;  
     vessels of, 224 ; its use in England,  
     422, 423  
 Glass, coloured, 417, 419, 421, 422  
 Glass, Mosaic, 417  
 Glastonbury, 36 ; monks of, 252  
 Gleemen of Anglo-Saxons, 225  
 Glevum (*see* Gloucester)  
 Gloucester, early town councillors of,  
     15 ; early name of, 16 ; Roman station  
     of, 62 ; nunnery and mint of, 205  
 Godric the Hermit, 408  
 Gods, of Rome worshipped in Britain,  
     26-28 ; of the Celts, 30-32 ; of the  
     Anglo-Saxons, 150-153  
 "God's pennies," 464  
 Godwin, 308  
 Goidels, the, 30, 33  
 Gold, 92, 203, 224  
 Gold coinage, 428  
 Goldsmiths, 193, 194, 467  
 Goldsmiths' Company, 387  
 Graham's Dyke, 12  
 Grammar, 333  
 Grammar schools, xxxii.  
 Gratian, 117  
 Greek, spread of the study of, xxxii.  
 Greek colonists of Marseilles, 85  
 Greek fire, 315, 316  
 Gregory the Great, 154, 157  
 Gregory VII., Pope, and William I., 269  
 Gromet, 412  
 Grosseteste, Bishop, as a Church re-  
     former, 393, 404 ; first Lector of the  
     Oxford Franciscans, 405, 433 ; his  
     literary works and personal author-  
     ity, 438 ; his book on agriculture, 455 ;  
     his "Liber Urbanitatis," 475 ; his  
     fondness for the harp, 487  
 Guild-associations, 407  
 Gunmakers' Company, 387  
 Guy de Lusignan, 315  
  
 Hadrian's Wall, 55  
 Hair, of the Celts, 114 ; of the Anglo-  
     Saxons, 222 ; of the Normans, 376,  
     480, 482 ; dyeing the, 482  
 Hall-moots, 137, 138  
*Hallclutia Victory*, the, 119  
 Ham, 122  
 Hand, cutting off the, 312  
 Handicrafts of early Britons, 86 ; among  
     the old English, 129 ; of the 13th  
     century, 465  
 Hanging, 292, 293, 296  
 "Hanse," the, or gild, 362  
 Hanse towns, exports to England from,  
     460, 469  
 Hardi-Canute, 148  
 "Hardinge of England," his maritime  
     expedition to the Holy Land, 310  
 Harold, distrust of, 147 ; appointed king,  
     148 ; his defeat at Hastings, 231 ; his  
     navy, 307  
 Harp, the, among the Normans, 487  
 Harvests, bad, 472, 473  
 Harvey, William, xxxiv.  
 Hatfield, Battle of, 157  
 Hats and caps, 481  
 "Havelok the Dane," 449  
 Hawberk, 302, 482  
 Hawking, 225, 379  
  
 Head gear, 481  
 Health, of the 6th to 11th centuries, 173-  
     176 ; in 12th and 13th centuries, 367-  
     371, 472, 473  
 Heaumes, 485  
 Hecatæus, 67  
 Helmets, 483, 484  
 Hengist, or Hengist, 119  
 Henley, Sir Walter de, book on agri-  
     culture by, 455, 456  
 Henry of Huntingdon, the "Historia  
     Anglorum" of, 451  
 Henry I., alliance between the Crown  
     and the people in reign of, 245 ;  
     general advancement under, 246 ;  
     his laws, 247  
 Henry II., his measures for crushing  
     feudalism, 259 ; his system of scutage,  
     259 ; his wars, 259 ; his quarrel with  
     Becket, 260 ; his expedition to Ireland,  
     260 ; surrender of King of Scots to,  
     261 ; his sons, 261 ; the great reforms  
     under, 262, 409  
 Henry III., chief elements of his reign,  
     391 ; his conflict with the barons,  
     391 ; taken prisoner at the battle of  
     Lewes, 395 ; his enlargement and  
     decoration of Westminster Abbey,  
     417, 418  
 Henry, Prince, of Scotland, 302  
 Hereward, 234  
 Hermits, 408  
 Herring fishery of Sandwich, 206  
 Herschel, Sir William, xxxiv.  
 Hertford, Council of, 160  
 Himilco, 67  
 Historical writing, development of, 445  
 Hoard, king's, 136  
 Hobbes, Thomas, xxxiv.  
 Hogarth, xvi.  
 Holy Communion, controversy on the  
     doctrine of the, 332, 333  
 Holy Land, crusade of 1147 to, 259 ;  
     Edgar's maritime expedition to, 310 ;  
     Hardinge of England's expedition to,  
     310  
 Homesteads of early Britain, 4  
 Homicide, penalty for, in Anglo-Saxon  
     times, 172 ; under William I., 275 ;  
     on the high seas, 312 ; of shipwrecked  
     persons, 314  
 Honorius, 118  
 Hooker, Bishop, xl.  
 Horsa, 119  
 Horse-racing among Anglo-Saxons, 225  
 Horses, 214 ; Norman, 489  
 Hospitality to strangers, 110, 111  
 Hospitals, 368-370  
 Host-leaders, 131  
 Hounds, 87  
 Hours of labour, regulation of, 364  
 House of Commons, De Montfort's, 399  
*House-curles*, 135, 139, 143, 149, 184  
 Houses, of 12th century, 330, 381, 382  
 Hoveden, Roger, 445  
 Hubert de Burgh, 304 ; defeats King  
     Louis' fleet, 391  
 Hugh of Avalon, Bishop, refuses  
     Richard I.'s demands for money, 264 ;  
     washes the sores of lepers, 272 ; as a  
     Church reformer, 273 ; introduces  
     Early English style of architecture, 326  
 Hugh of Pusey, Bishop, 328  
 Hugh of Shrewsbury, 3  
 Human sacrifices, 19  
*Hundred-moots*, 137, 138, 170  
 Hunter, John, xxxiv.  
 Hunting among Anglo-Saxons, 225 ; of  
     Londoners, 379  
 Husting Court at London, 365  
 Hymns, religious, 186



- Iberians in early Britain contrasted with Celts, xxii.; 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 30, 43; weapons and implements of, 43, 44, 52
- Iceni, the, 53, 54, 101
- Illumination, art of, 194, 195; in Norman times, 331
- Ine, laws of, 167, 203
- Innocent III., Pope, excommunicates John, 266, 274
- Inns, 56, 366
- Inquest, 288
- Iona, St. Columba founds the monastery of, 155; the work of its missionaries in the conversion of England, 217; 220
- Ireland, work of the missionaries of, xxv.; 12, 23; its conversion to Christianity, 39; 90, 132, 133; expedition of Henry II. to, 260, 311
- Iron, 85, 89, 92; cost of, in mediæval times, 359
- Iron Age in Britain, 68
- Isca Silurum (*see* Caerleon)
- Isle of Man, Gaels in the, 2
- Isle of Thanet, 18
- Jet, 92
- Jews, their arrival in England, 244; financing the building of churches, 326; 387; persecuted, 387, *note*, 407; their enterprise in the 13th century, 467; their dealings regulated by the Crown, 471; their influence on trade, 471
- "Jews' House," Lincoln, 330
- Jocelyn, Bishop, 419, 427
- John de Cella, 445
- John, King, his plotting to secure the crown, 263; his reign, 263-267; his conflict with the barons, 265, 267; his excommunication, 266; signs the Charter, 267
- John of Salisbury, his learning, 336, 341; his foreign training, 340; as a theologian and ecclesiastic, 341, 342
- Jongleurs, or Joglars, 486, 487
- Juries, Grand, 263
- Jurisprudence, growth of, in 12th and 13th centuries, 408-410
- Jurors, earliest, 290
- Jury, trial by, 285-295
- Juvenal, 25
- Kidnapping, 252
- Kilwardby, Robert, 406
- "King Horn," 449
- "King of Sicily," 393
- "King Waldere's Lay," 190
- King's hunter, duties of, 128
- Kings, tribal, 6, 118; of old English, 134, 136
- Kitchen utensils of the 13th century, 475, 476
- Knighthood, 382, 383, 485
- Knights for shire representation, 396, 398
- Knights, Norman, dress of, 484
- Knights Templars, sale of Cyprus to, 315
- Knook Castle, 45, 46
- Labour, forced, 22
- "Lady's bower," the, 382
- Land, division of, by families, 4-6; acres under tillage after the Norman Conquest, 239, 357; change of ownership at the Conquest, 240; community in cultivation of, 358; area cultivated in 13th and 14th centuries, 452, 453; disposal of produce of, 459
- Landed classes among the old English, 126-128
- Lanfranc, appointed Archbishop of Canterbury, 248; his relations to the Papacy, 249, 250; as Church reformer, 251, 252; compared with Anselm, 253; opposes Berengar in the controversy on the Holy Communion, 333
- Langton, Archbishop, appointed by the Pope to the See of Canterbury, 266; his patriotism, 274; his treatment by John, 266; his restoration to the primacy, 392
- Language of Celts and Gaels, 2; in Britain after English conquest, 132, 133; of the 12th century, 354; of the Court, of literature, and of private life in the reign of Henry III., 442, 443; mingling of English with Anglo-Norman, 444
- Latin, as the legal language of England, 278, 442; at the universities, 443
- Law, Canon, 281
- Law, Roman, 280, 282
- Law Courts, under Henry II., 277, 280
- Laws, their relation to the character of the people, xiii.; old English, 133, 134, 165-173; first English code of, 165; of Ine, 167; Alfred's, 167, 168; Canute's, 168; Edward the Confessor's, 169; Danish, 170; characteristics of early, 170-173; influence of Roman upon English, 172; of William the Conqueror, 242, 275; of Henry I., 247; of Henry II., 277; mediæval reforms of, 280-298
- Laws of Oleron, 313
- Lawyers, 170, 409
- Lead, 89, 91, 92, 203
- Learning and science, their parallel growth with religion in early times, xxx.; from 17th to 19th century, xxiv.-xxvii.; in the 11th century, 332-343; in the 13th century, 429-440
- Legal language, 278, 279
- Leper hospitals, 368-370
- Leprosy, 367-370, 405
- Letters of credit, 387
- Lewes, Battle of, 395
- Liberti*, 125
- Licences for traders in 13th century, 471
- Lichen as a dye, 88
- Lincoln, 15, 16, 62; Battle of, 301; churches at, 320, 321
- Lincoln Cathedral, 326, 327
- Lindum Colonia (*see* Lincoln)
- Literature, growth of, to 19th century, xxxvii.-xlii.; old English, 184-193; of the 12th century, 343; religious, of the 12th century, 347; scientific and historical, of the 12th century, 347-354; poetical of the 12th century, 355; prose and poetical of the 13th century, 445-450
- Liturgy of early Christian Church in Britain, 40
- Livery companies, 387
- Locke, John, xxxiv.
- Lodestone, 415
- Logic, 333, 335
- Lollardism, xxvii.
- Lombard, Peter, "Sentences of," 335
- London, in 61 A.D., 11; 13, 16, 62; in Roman times, 78; Roman mint in, 84; earthenware of, 93; captured by British tribes, 101; in Anglo-Saxon times, 204, 205; municipal progress in reign of Richard I., 263; as a commercial port in the reign of Henry II., 311, 386; William I.'s charter

- granted to, 362, 372; its growth in the 12th century, 366; number of churches in the 12th century, 366; suburbs of, 376; manners and amusements of, 377; schools of, 379; famine of 1258 in, 473, 479; eating-houses of, 478, 479  
 London Bridge, 205  
 Long-bow, the, 411  
 Longchamp, Bishop, his unpopularity and exile, 263; his extravagance, 384  
 Loriners, 467  
 Lud, 89  
 Luguwallum (*see* Carlisle)  
 Lundy, a piratical stronghold, 413  
 Lydney, mosaic pavements at, 79, 81; temple to Lud at, 89  
 Lyme, 22  
  
 Macaulay, Lord, on the increase of national wealth, lii.  
 "Mad Parliament," the, 394  
 Magic, 25  
 Magister Coquus, the, 476  
 Magistrates, 15  
 Magnus, the Norwegian, 3  
 Malcolm, King of Scots, 146  
 Mallin Castle, 320  
 Mandubratius, 7  
 Manners, of a people, the resultant of many forces, xx; of England, general progress in, liii.-lvi.  
 Manor-houses, 426  
 Manorial records, 456  
 Manors, 356, 451; records of, 456  
 Mantles, 480  
 Manufacturers of the 13th century, 465, 467  
 Map, Walter, 342, 353  
 Mariner's compass, 414  
 Maritime adventure, English love of, 310  
 Maritime ordinances of Richard I., 312  
 Marlowe, xli.  
 Markets, 140, 208; of the 13th century, 461, 462  
 Marriage customs among early Britons, 103, 104; among Anglo-Saxons, 215; of the 13th century, 474  
 Martial, 25  
 Mediterranean, English trade with the, 461  
 Menapii, the, 116  
 Merchant service, laws of Oleron for the, 313; under Henry III., 415  
 Merchants, among the old English, 129; foreign, 469  
 Merton College, the model of later colleges, 435  
 Metal work in early Britain, 69; of Roman Britain, 83; in churches, 380  
 Middlemen, 473  
 Milestones (*milliaria*), 56  
 Military centres in Roman Britain, 17  
 Military organisation of Anglo-Saxons, 176-178  
 Militia, 262  
 Mills, 466  
 Milton, xli.  
 Mines, 91  
 Minstrels, 486  
 Minstrels' gallery, 382  
 Mint, in London, 84; at Verulam, 99; at Gloucester, 205  
 Miracle-plays, 377  
 Missionaries, Irish, their work among Saxon princes, xxv.  
 Mistletoe, the, in Druidism, 35  
 Mithras-worship in Britain, 23, 74  
 "Model Parliament," the, 396  
 Monasteries, 38; in Scotland, 155; pillaged by the Danes, 161; Dunstan's Reforms of, 162; industrial centres, 207; centres of learning and hospitality, 218, 219, 385; their growth in the reign of Stephen, 268; dissensions in, 385; agriculture advanced by, 455; luxurious living in, 477, 478  
 Monks of Glastonbury, 252  
 Monkwearmouth Church, 197, 198, 320  
 Mosaic pavements, 24, 79; at Brading, 80; at Lydney and Woodchester, 81, 94  
 "Moyses Hall," Bury, 330  
 Music amongst early Britons, 110; amongst Anglo-Saxons, 225; in the 13th century, 475, 486; as one of the Seven Liberal Arts, 333  
 Musical instruments, among Anglo-Saxons, 195; amongst the Normans, 487, 488  
*Mycel-gemót*, the, 136  
  
 Naming children, 106  
 Napery, 478  
 Nature, deification of, 31  
 Naval architecture, 310  
 Naval expeditions of Richard I., 315, 316  
 Naval warfare, between Richard I. and the Turks, 316; in the 13th century, 414  
 Navigation laws of Henry II., 311  
 Navy, old English, 139, 182, 202; of William the Conqueror, 304; of Harold, 307; of Henry I., 309; improvements under John in the, 317-319; in the 13th century, 411-415  
 Neolithic men, 43, 65 (*see also* Iberians)  
 Nerva, 16  
 New Forest, pottery production in, 93; hunting in, 379  
 Newcastle, 18, 27  
 Newton, Isaac, xxxiv.  
 Nominalism, 333-335  
 Norfolk, site of the woollen trade, 454  
 Norman architecture, 319-330  
 Norman Conquest, its advantages to England, 231, 243, 265, 361  
 Normandy, loss of, 265  
 Normans, Teutonic, in Britain, 3  
 Northumberland, Roman earthworks in, 95; incorporation with English realm, 147  
 Norwich, 18  
 Novgorod Fair, 460  
  
 Oakham Castle, 325, 330  
 Oath, trial by, 285  
 Odo, St., supported by Dunstan, 121; Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, his oppression of the English, 232; taken prisoner by William I., 244, 384  
 Offa, laws of, 167, 179; coins of, 200  
 Ogbury, primitive fortress at, 47  
 Oleron, laws of, 313  
 Open parishes, 358  
 Orchards, 359  
 Ordeal, trial by, 286  
 Ordovices, the, 102  
 Organ, the, among the Normans, 488  
 Ornaments of early Britons, 88, 102, 103; of Anglo-Saxons, 193, 222  
 Orosius, 7  
 "Orpheo," 450  
 Oswald, 158  
 Oswy, King (*Osuu*), 159, 220  
 Outlawry, 296  
 Ovates, the, 103  
 "Owl and the Nightingale," 448

Oxford, 205; account of, in Domesday Book, 239, 361; fairs at, 365; "Mad Parliament" of, 394  
 Ox-herd's duties among the old English, 128  
 Oysters, 92

Paganism, in Britain, xxv., 30-32; Anglo-Saxon, 149-153  
 Pandulf, 392  
 Papal relationships with William I., 249; excommunication of King John, 266, 274; riches drawn from England by Popes, 394  
 Paris, Matthew, 445; his "Historia Major," and his trustworthiness as an historian, 446, 447, 472  
 Parliament, origin of, 396-403  
 "Parliament" of Henry III., 394  
 Parliamentary representation, elements of, 396  
 Parochial system, 160  
 "Parzifal," the, 354  
 Patronus, the, 125  
 Paulinus, Suetonius, 54  
 Pearls, 89, 92, 99  
 Peasants' rights, 126  
 Peasantry, improvement in their position in the reign of Henry III., 450  
*Peine Forte et Dure*, 292  
 Pelagius, 39  
 Penances among Anglo-Saxons, 224  
 Pestilence, of 1257-59; of 1315-16, 472, 473  
 Peter of Blois, 343  
 Peter des Roches, 392  
 Peterborough Cathedral, 417  
 Peterborough Chronicle of the Norman Conquest, 235, 236  
 Physicians, Jewish, 406  
 Picts, the, 18, 96, 155  
 Picts' Wall, 12  
 Pie-Powder, Courts of, 464  
 Pilots, 314  
 Pipe Rolls, the, 467, 468  
 Pirates, 117, 140; during the rule of the Normans, 308, 309; at the Cinque Ports, 413  
 Plague, the, in early English times, 174; of 1348, 451  
 Plantagenets, the, 258  
 Plautius, Aulus, 7, 53  
 Pliny the elder, 87  
 Ploughmen's duties amongst old English, 128  
 Ploughs, 359  
 Poetry, of Scandinavian settlers, 144; of Anglo-Saxons, 152, 185-192; Norman-French, 345, 355; English, from 1218-1273, 447-450  
 Police of old English, 138  
 Politics, their influence upon social progress, xiv.  
 Polyandry, 104  
 Polygamy, 104, 216  
 Pons Ælius (see Newcastle)  
 Poore, Bishop, and Salisbury Cathedral, 416  
 Pope, Alexander, xli.  
 Population of Britain, 95; in old English times, 133, 206; after the Norman Conquest, 240, 357  
 Portsmouth, as a place of naval importance, 311, 318  
 Portus Lemanis (see Lymne)  
 Posidonius, his visit to Britain, 85  
 Pottery, in the Bronze Age, 66; of Roman Britain, 83; of Celtic Britain, 92  
*Præsidēs*, 13  
 Prasutagus, 101  
 Preaching of the friars, 433

Pressing seamen, 318  
 Priestley, Joseph, xxxiv.  
 Priests, Romish, revenue of, in England, 404  
 Printing, invention of, xl., xliv.  
 Privateers, licensed by Henry III., 413  
 Prize money for seamen, 318  
 Protestantism, its influence on the people, xxix.  
 Proverbs, collections of, in 13th century, 448  
 Provisions of Marlborough, 410  
 Provisions of Merton, 410  
 Provisions of Oxford, 394  
 Provisions of Westminster, 395  
 Pullan, Robert, "Sentences" of, 335, 342  
 Punishments under old English law, 137; for offences on the seas, 312, 313; for plunderers of wrecks, 314  
 Puritanism, its influence on the nation, xxix.  
 Pytheas, his visit to Britain, 67, 85


*Quadrivium*, the, or second course of training in the schools, 333

Ransom of Richard I., 367  
 Ranulph, Bishop, 384  
 Realism, 333-335  
 Recumbium (see Reculver)  
 Reculver, 18, 83  
*Referendarius* (chancellor), King's, 136  
 Reformation, the, its influence on the Church, xxviii.  
 Religion in early Britain, 25-29, 30-42, 74, 103; among English and Danes, 149-164  
 Remi, Bishop, 320  
 Renaissance, the, xxxii.  
 "Reneward and Sigrim," 450  
 Representative government, 396-400  
 Rhetoric, 333  
 Rich, Edmund, 393, 403; lectures at Oxford on Aristotle, 435  
 Richard I., 262-264; his laws for the government of the fleet and merchant navy, 312; ships of, 314, 315-317; his ransom, 367; 450  
 Richard of Cornwall, 393  
 Richard of Devizes, 363  
 Richard the Marshall, 392  
 Richborough, 18, 62, 95, 97  
 Rishanger, William, his "Cronica," 447  
 Roads, 19; Celtic, 49, 50; earliest Roman, 51, 56, 90; in Norman times, 366; of the 13th century, 462, 469  
 Robert of Gloucester, 373, 443  
 Robbery, 111, 112; on the highway, 462  
 Robert of Melun, 342  
 Robin Hood, 379  
 Roger, Bishop, 323  
 Roger of Wendover, his "Flores Historiarum," 445  
 Roland, Song of (see "Roman de Rou"), 486  
 Roland (Pope Alexander III.), "Sentences" of, 335  
 Roll of Battle Abbey, 373, 374  
 Roman influence in Britain, limited extent of, xxiii.  
 "Roman de Rou," the, 346, 347  
 Romances, Welsh, allusions to British handicrafts in, 86  
 Rome, arrest of emigration to Britain by 2; wandering tribes influenced by, 3; conquest of Britain by, 7, 8, 9, 11, 53; its influence and prestige of Britain, 10, 11; its limits of conquest in Britain, 12; its system of government in, 12-18; British worship of

- the gods of, 26-28, 73; its military organisation in Britain, 56-64; its withdrawal from Britain, 96  
 Roscelin of Compiègne, 333  
 Runes, 151, 219, 483  
 Rutupiae (see Richborough)
- Saga*, the, 144  
 Saint Alban, 16; martyrdom of St. Alban at, 37; victory of the Romans at, 53; Roman station and municipal town, 62; constructed out of the ruins of, Verulamium, 76; its present position, 98; tombs of English abbots destroyed at, 252  
 Saint Albert the Great, 437  
 Saint Bernard, 333  
 Saint Columba, 155  
 Saint George, banner of, 315  
 Saint Joseph and the introduction of Christianity into Britain, 36  
 Saint Patrick and slavery, 87, 155  
 Saint Paul's Cathedral, 205  
 Salisbury Cathedral, 327; architecture of, 416  
 Salt making, 207  
 Sanctuary, right of, 42, 296, 297  
 Sandals, 465  
 Sandwich, 206  
 Sarcenet, 481  
 Sarum, 130; cathedral of, 323  
 Saxons, civil organisation of, xxiv.; their invasion of Britain, 3, 96, 118, 119; settlements in England, 131  
 Scandinavian settlement in England, 140-149  
 Scapula, Publius Ostorius, 53  
 Scholasticism, its supremacy from 13th to 15th century, xxxi.  
 School of Canterbury, 312  
 Schools, of cathedral churches and monasteries, 337; of London, 379  
 Schools, mediæval, text-books of, 336  
*Scir-gerefa* (sheriff), 138  
 Scotland, struggles of Gaels and Celts in, 2; its conversion to Christianity, 39, 155, 159; Agricola's conquests in, 54, 60; its submission to William the Conqueror, 235; revolt of the king, and his final submission to Henry II., 260, 261; famine of 1439 in, 473  
 Scots, their descent on Britain, 96, 118, 155  
 Sculpture, xlv., 380; at Wells Cathedral, 419, 420  
 Scutage, 259, 265, 302  
 Scutcheon, the royal, 483  
 "Seafarer, The," 190  
 Seals, royal, devices on, 483  
 Seamen, laws of Richard I. for the good conduct of, 312, 313; laws of Oleron for, 313; King John's wages to, 317  
 Seneca, loan to Britain, 21  
 Sendel, 481, 488  
 Senlac, Battle of, 231, 299  
 "Sentences," of Robert Pullan, Roland, and Peter Lombard, 335  
 Serapis, worship of, 74  
 Serfs, 125, 203, 206, 209  
*Serri*, 125  
 Settlements of English and Danes in Britain, 130-132  
 Seven Liberal Arts, 333  
 Severn, the, 89  
 Severus, Emperor, 13  
 Severus, Wall of, 55  
 Seviri, the, 15  
 Sewer, or server, the, 477 and *note*  
 Shakespeare, xli.  
 Shaving the face, 480  
 Sheep, 213; outbreak of disease among, 452; their rearing undertaken by monks, 454; profits from, 459  
 Shepherds' duties among the old English, 128  
 Sheriffs, 138, 262  
 Shields, devices on, 483; shape of, 483, 484  
 Ships, of early Britons, 88; of Norman invaders, 306; of England of the 12th century, 312; names and types of Richard I.'s, 314, 315; of merchants in 12th and 13th centuries, 386 (see also *Navy*)  
 Shipwrecked persons, laws for protection of, 311, 314  
 Shire-courts, 397  
*Shire-moot*, 137, 399  
 Shiros, 138, 145, 396, 397  
 Shops, arrangement of, 468  
 Siculus, Diodorus, 67  
 Silchester, 14; amphitheatre at, 24, 62; its extent, 76; capital of the Atrebatæ, 98; fired and destroyed, 133  
 Silks, importation of, 461  
 Silures, the, 7  
 Silvanus, tablet of thanksgiving to, 90  
 Silver, 90, 203, 224  
 Silvester, Bernard, 340, 341  
 Simon de Montfort, 393-395; his "House of Commons," 399, 400  
 "Sir Tristrem," 450  
 Slate, 92  
 Slavery in early Britain, 87, 92, 125; under the English and Danes, 132, 203-205, 212, 221; measures against, 252; return in Domesday Book of, 357; prohibited by Henry I., 372  
 Smith, Adam, xxxv.—  
 "Smooth-field" (Smithfield), 377; market of, 462  
 Snake's egg, myth of the, 35  
 Social aspects, of civilisation, xiii.; of early Britain, xxiii., 3-6; of Celtic and Roman Britain, 98-114; of early England, 124, 125, 210-228; under the Normans, 371-382, 473-489  
 Social classes, old English, 124, 125  
 Social order, its uniform growth since the English conquest, xxiv.  
 Socmen, 360  
 "Solar," the, 382  
 Soldiers, rewards to, 20  
 Soldiers of fortune, 302  
 Southampton, trade of, 460  
 Sovereignty of the seas, 318  
 Spears of English yeoman, 302; of Norman knights, 483  
 Spices, importation of, 460, 461  
 Standard (*signum*) of the Roman legion, 63  
 Standards of value in early Britain, 85  
 State, the, as a society, xlii.; influenced by other States, xiv.  
 Statute of Maribridge, 410  
 Steam, locomotion, xxxv.  
 Steelyard, the, 364  
 Stephen, King, 255-258  
 Stone-cutting, 92  
 Stonehenge, 68  
 Stories and legends:—The enchanted calf-skin and Arthur's knights, 5; the mysterious cries in the theatre of Colchester, 19, *note*, 103; Seneca's loan of money to Britain, 21; the Welsh hag and the bedridden poet, 33; the Druids and the snake's egg, 35; St. Joseph's staff at Glastonbury, 36; legends of the plough, of swine and of bees, 87; the luxurious court of Cartimandua, 100; funeral rites









**THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY  
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT**

**This book is under no circumstances to be  
taken from the Building**

[illegible]

